



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2009

No. 125

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 8, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE DRIEHAUS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:
Lord God, creator of the Earth, the sea and the sky, everything is of Your making and all gives You glory.

This holiday weekend urges us to beg Your blessing upon our labors. Whether our work is handcrafted or managed by computer or machine, harvested from the field or designed in a laboratory, whether our service takes shape in public form, in aerospace or private industry, whether in courtroom, hospital, school, home, or in the halls of government, Lord, bless the work of Your people. Bless this Nation.

Our human labor drains our energy, fixes our mind, and uncovers our creativity. Daily work adds dignity and accomplishment to daily life and all human effort. When our work is expanded to others, hopefully it benefits our brothers and sisters. When offered to You as an act of worship, it becomes holy. Grant success to the work of our hands, Lord, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 4, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 4, 2009, at 12:01 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 774.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 987.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1271.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1397.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2090.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2162.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2325.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2422.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2470.

Appointments:

Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 4, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 4, 2009, at 3:14 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 748.

That the Senate passed S. 1211.

That the Senate passed S. 1314.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 5, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 5, 2009, at 10:03 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H.J. Res. 44.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9285

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 5, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 5, 2009, at 4:47 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment, requests a conference with the House, and appoints conferees H.R. 2997.

That the Senate passed S. 475.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 6, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 6, 2009, at 9:59 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 713.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1275.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2938.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 171.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, September 3, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 3, 2009, at 10:42 a.m.:

Appointments:

Public Interest Declassification Board

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed by Speaker pro tempore HOYER on Thursday, August 6, 2009:

H.R. 774, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, as the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building"

H.R. 987, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 8th Street in Freedom, Pennsylvania, as the "John Scott Challis, Jr. Post Office"

H.R. 1271, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building"

H.R. 1275, to direct the exchange of certain land in Grand, San Juan, and Uintah Counties, Utah, and for other purposes

H.R. 1397, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building"

H.R. 2090, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 431 State Street in Ogdensburg, New York, as the "Frederic Remington Post Office Building"

H.R. 2162, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 11th Avenue South in Nampa, Idaho, as the "Herbert A Littleton Postal Station"

H.R. 2325, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Matamoros Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "Laredo Veterans Post Office"

H.R. 2422, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2300 Scenic Drive in Georgetown, Texas, as the "Kile G. West Post Office Building"

H.R. 2470, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 19190 Cochran Boulevard FRNT in Port Charlotte, Florida, as the "Lieutenant Commander Roy H. Boehm Post Office Building"

H.R. 2938, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project

H.R. 3435, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program

H.J. Res. 44, recognizing the service, sacrifice, honor, and professionalism of the Noncommissioned Officers of the United States Army

S.J. Res. 19, granting the consent and approval of Congress to amendments made by the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact

CONGRATULATING AMY MCBROOM, 2009 RURAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Amy McBroom of Grand Canyon, Arizona, who has been named the 2009 Rural Teacher of the Year by the National Rural Education Association.

As the only art teacher at the Grand Canyon Unified School District, Amy teaches students from kindergarten to twelfth grade. She founded a juried art show for students and led efforts to bring new international baccalaureate programs to our schools.

Like so many of our teachers, Amy's work educating our kids does not stop when the school year ends. She spends her summers helping Native American children experience different cultures, and she has led field trips to Europe and Washington, D.C.

A quality education is more important than ever to succeeding in today's global economy, and getting a quality education takes great teachers like Amy McBroom. Northern Arizona is lucky to have her.

Congratulations to Amy for this recognition for her work.

WE NEED HEALTH CARE REFORM THAT PUTS PATIENTS FIRST

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it was a long, hot August for many Members of Congress who returned home to face the displeasure of constituents fed up with Washington's tin ear syndrome.

Over the past month I have heard from more people than I can count who have had enough of the explosion of Washington-style big government. And of course it was no comfort that in the middle of August the White House announced that they expect \$9.1 trillion in new government debt over the next 10 years. So how is it that the American people are expected to stomach a new government-run health care proposal that is estimated to cost up to \$1.6 trillion?

Let's scrap the Democrat government-run health care proposal and return to the drawing board for a plan like ones that Republicans have offered that puts patients, not government, first.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, Congress has come back here in September and the primary focus is on health care, as it should be. But I rise today to speak

about the health of millions of Californians that are dependent upon a reliable water supply. I'm speaking on behalf of farmers, farm workers, and people who live in our cities.

This manmade—with the aid of Mother Nature—drought crisis will not go away. It could go a fourth year. We are living on borrowed time to fix California's broken water system. Wishful thinking will not wish it away.

With over 30 lawsuits pending on two biological opinions, we can't have the courts making the most important decisions. It is time that we take action. Now is the time for the Federal Government to keep its commitment to being a partner in helping to solve California's water problems. We need administrative flexibility immediately. We need near-term assistance with the Two-Gates and Intertie projects. And in the long term, we must address all the stressors that are impacting water quality and fisheries in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. And finally, we need to increase our water supply.

This is not, nor should it be, a partisan issue.

GOVERNMENT HEALTH CARE FORCE-FEEDS TAX INCREASES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I heard most from my neighbors at recent town hall health care meetings is they don't want the government in charge of their health. They believe government-run health care means rationing and substandard treatment. And the people in southeast Texas don't want the additional \$800 billion tax increases to pay for what is yet more government intrusion into their lives.

This massive 1,017-page bill requires heavyhanded tax increases to pay for all the new government programs that don't treat one patient, nor will they provide for a healthier America. In this time of economic hardship, no one in America should be force-fed tax increases to pay for this glittering illusion that Big Government is the answer.

America has the best health care in the world. There are problems, such as affordability and access, but complete government takeover is not the answer. Fix these problems rather than destroy American health care.

Does anyone really think the government can do a better job of running the entire medical health of this Nation? This government-run health care plan will have the competence of FEMA, the efficiency of the Post Office, and the compassion of the IRS.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING BELLA VISTA POLICE CHIEF JIM WOZNIAK

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bella Vista Police Chief Jim Wozniak, who has devoted his life to protecting the public, upholding the law, and serving his country.

Wozniak is retiring at the end of September after 38 years in law enforcement, the last 14 as the head of the Bella Vista Police Department. He helped the department grow from nine officers to 20, and he is always looking for ways to improve the police force and the services it offers. He is proud of his department, and rightfully so, because he makes sure his staff put the people first.

His coworkers describe him as a man with a big heart, and I describe him as a friend. Bella Vista will undoubtedly be losing an amazing man who contributed to the safety of the community. We were blessed to have such caring, devoted citizens as Jim.

I commend him for his service as well as his good work and wish him continued success in the future. I ask my colleagues today to join with me in honoring Jim Wozniak, a wonderful public servant who is, and always will be, dedicated to the people of Bella Vista.

□ 1415

WE'D BETTER LISTEN

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the American people. I had five town-hall meetings this summer. I did a tele-townhall in which I had 19,000 people on the line.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I saw no mobs. I saw nothing that was un-American. I saw no evil mongers out there. I saw average, everyday Americans coming to my townhall meetings in ones and twos and threes, not being bussed in by anybody. They were educated about the issue of health care. They understood what was on the floor. These people are concerned about what we might do here. They are also concerned about taxes, spending, debt, and the size of the Federal Government. No, they were not American mobs. These were real Americans, expressing what they're allowed to do under the Constitution in the best way they can, directly speaking with their Members of Congress. We'd better listen.

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE AND FISCAL IR- RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, since Democrats took control of Washington last January, they have gone on an un-

precedented spending spree with the American taxpayers' credit card. It began with a \$1 trillion stimulus bill, which has only stimulated more government and more debt. Then came a more than \$400 billion omnibus spending bill, followed by a \$3.5 trillion budget for the next fiscal year. Budget officials predict that this year's deficit will reach an historic level of nearly \$2 trillion—money borrowed from our children and grandchildren.

After 6 months of fiscal irresponsibility, they are now pushing for a government takeover of health care that will grow our national debt and will do little to extend quality care to the American people. Despite raising more than \$800 billion in new taxes to pay for this plan, we will also go into debt by \$239 billion over the next 10 years to pay for it.

Republicans have a better plan for health care reform, one that does not saddle our children and grandchildren with a mountain of new debt.

EIGHT YEARS OF RUINOUS REPUBLICAN CONTROL

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to some of what I've just heard on the floor of the House of Representatives. I think it's important to know—and certainly my constituents do—that the crushing debt left behind from the last 8 years of ruinous Republican control was a debt inherited by this Congress and this administration because of Republican policies, of the refusal to pay for the programs they undertook, of the willingness to allow PAYGO legislation to expire, to provide a medical care provision in the Medicare D prescription drug benefit that was not paid for, and to have two ruinous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that were off budget. I think it's important that our constituents understand who was responsible for the debt we now have to manage and the debt we have to get away from.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 179) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 179

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, September 9, 2009, at 8 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

DEAFY GLADE LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1043) to provide for a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Mendocino National Forest in the State of California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1043

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Deafy Glade Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, MENDOCINO NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—If Solano County, California (in this section referred to as the "County") conveys to the Secretary of Agriculture all right, title, and interest of the County in and to four parcels of land consisting of a total of approximately 160 acres identified on the map entitled "Fouts Springs-Deafy Glade Federal and Non-Federal Lands" and dated July 17, 2008, the Secretary shall convey to the County, in exchange, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land in the Mendocino National Forest in the State of California (including any improvements on the land) comprising approximately 82 acres and known as the Fouts Springs Ranch, as also depicted on the map.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service. With the agreement of the County, the Secretary may make technical corrections to the map and the legal descriptions of the land to be exchanged under this section.

(c) LAND EXCHANGE PROCESS.—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange under this section.

(d) SURVEY AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be exchanged under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The costs of the survey and any administrative costs related to the land exchange shall be borne by the County.

(e) CONDITION ON USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—As a condition of the conveyance to the County under subsection (a), the County shall agree to continue to use the land acquired by the County under such subsection for purposes consistent with the purposes listed in the special use authorization for the Fouts Springs Ranch in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) EASEMENT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may grant an easement to provide continued access to, and maintenance and use of, the facilities covered by the special use authorization referred to in subsection (e) as necessary for the continued operation of the Fouts Springs Ranch conveyed under subsection (a).

(g) MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The lands acquired by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be added to and administered as part of the Mendocino National Forest and managed in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.) and the laws and regulations applicable to the National Forest System.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The land exchange under subsection (a) shall be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary and the County may agree upon.

(i) CANCELLATION OF PORTION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCE IN FLREA SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The amount available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the unobligated balance in the special account established for the Forest Service under section 807 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6806) is reduced by a total of \$60,000, and the amount so reduced is hereby cancelled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1043 provides for a land exchange between the Forest Service and Solano County, California. Solano County currently has a special use permit from the Forest Service to operate the Fouts Springs Youth Correctional Facility on 82 acres of land in the Mendocino National Forest. The county has been working diligently for years to acquire wilderness-quality forest lands to exchange with the Forest Service in order to acquire the lands occupied by the youth correctional facility. The lands the Forest Service would acquire are wilderness-quality lands bordering the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area, and have been identified as priority areas for acquisition dating as far back as 1992. The land exchange would be for equal value.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Chairman GEORGE MILLER, is to be commended for his efforts on behalf of Solano County and this youth facility. An earlier version of this legislation passed the House last year by voice vote. I ask my colleagues to, once again, support the passage of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has adequately and has very well explained this bill. I don't believe there is anything to add at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, for his comments on his legislation, H.R. 1043.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1043, the Deafy Glade Land Exchange Act. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Chairman GRIJALVA of the Natural Resources Committee and the minority for bringing this legislation to the floor. As it was noted, this similar legislation passed on a voice vote in the last Congress.

The Fouts Springs Youth Facility has been managed by Solano County, Colusa County, and their partners for nearly 50 years. The bill before the House today guarantees that they can continue to do their good work. Fouts Springs has helped rehabilitate California's young offenders and has provided these young offenders from across the State with much-needed structure and significant vocational educational opportunities.

Presently, Solano County operates Fouts Springs on behalf of several other California counties under a special use authorization. This legislation, the Deafy Glade Land Exchange Act, will give Solano County the 82 acres that they use at Fouts Springs, and in exchange, it would give to the Mendocino National Forest 160 acres of nearby land known as Deafy Glade.

The Deafy Glade property has access to the Snow Mountain Wilderness Area, and it has been a high priority for acquisition by the Forest Service since at least the early 1990s. Last year, the Natural Resources Committee received testimony that the Deafy Glade parcels would be a key addition to the Mendocino National Forest's trail system.

Again, I want to thank the committee for its timely consideration of this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this matter when it comes before the House.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1043, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOROTHY BUELL MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1287) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a partnership with the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission regarding the use of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center as a visitor center for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1287

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DOROTHY BUELL MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center Partnership Act”.

(b) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into a memorandum of understanding to establish a joint partnership with the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission. The memorandum of understanding shall—

(1) identify the overall goals and purpose of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center;

(2) establish how management and operational duties will be shared;

(3) determine how exhibits, signs, and other information are developed;

(4) indicate how various activities will be funded;

(5) identify who is responsible for providing site amenities;

(6) establish procedures for changing or dissolving the joint partnership; and

(7) address any other issues deemed necessary by the Secretary or the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission.

(c) **DEVELOPMENT OF EXHIBITS.**—The Secretary may plan, design, construct, and install exhibits in the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center related to the use and management of the resources at Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, at a cost not to exceed \$1,500,000.

(d) **NATIONAL LAKESHORE PRESENCE.**—The Secretary may use park staff from Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center to provide visitor information and education.

SEC. 2. INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE.

Section 19 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes” (16 U.S.C. 460u–19) is amended—

(1) by striking “After notifying” and inserting “(a) After notifying”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **CONTIGUOUS CLARIFIED.**—For purposes of subsection (a), lands may be considered contiguous to other lands if the lands touch the other lands, or are separated from the other lands by only a public or private right-of-way, such as a road, railroad, or utility corridor.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1287 will allow the National Park Service to share visitor center facilities for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore with the local county's Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission. The bill also allows the National Park Service to construct exhibits at the visitor center, and authorizes NPS employees to work there since the visitor center lies outside the established boundaries of the park.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1287 would clarify the definition of “contiguous lands” in the park's original legislation so that NPS could accept donations of contiguous land even if that land is separated by a right-of-way, such as a road, a railway line or a utility corridor.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VISCLOSKEY has been working hard on this bill for a long time and is to be commended for his diligence and persistence. The legislation passed the House last Congress by an overwhelming vote. I ask my colleagues, once again, to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1287 has been well explained by the majority, and we support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would yield as much time as he may consume to the sponsor of H.R. 1287, Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1287, the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center Lease Act. I am the proud sponsor of this legislation, and as I have in the previous Congress, I thank Mr. DONNELLY for joining me as a cosponsor.

I also do want to thank Chairman RAHALL, Ranking Member HASTINGS, Subcommittee Ranking Member BISHOP, and especially Subcommittee Chairman GRIJALVA for all of their hard work in ensuring that this legislation is brought to the floor.

It has been explained and I will simply say that it is my sincere hope that this legislation will enable the continuance of our efforts to protect and to enhance the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and to ensure that all Americans can benefit from the park. The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which was established in 1966, is relatively new, but as it continues to mature, the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center will be vital in helping to provide each lakeshore visitor a complete and rewarding experience.

Mr. Speaker, we should not delay the lakeshore's ability to mature, thus allowing more people to appreciate the natural beauty of northwest Indiana.

Again, I urge my colleagues, as they did in the last Congress, to support this measure.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further speakers, then I would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1287.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 324) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 324

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Purposes.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Designation of Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.

Sec. 5. Management plan.

Sec. 6. Evaluation; report.

Sec. 7. Local coordinating entity.

Sec. 8. Relationship to other Federal agencies.

Sec. 9. Private property and regulatory protections.

Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 11. Use of Federal funds from other sources.

Sec. 12. Sunset for grants and other assistance.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act include—

(1) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Arizona;

(2) to implement the recommendations of the “Alternative Concepts for Commemorating Spanish Colonization” study completed by the National Park Service in 1991, and the “Feasibility Study for the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area” prepared by the Center for Desert Archaeology in July 2005;

(3) to provide a management framework to foster a close working relationship with all levels of government, the private sector, and the local communities in the region and to conserve the region's heritage while continuing to pursue compatible economic opportunities;

(4) to assist communities, organizations, and citizens in the State of Arizona in identifying, preserving, interpreting, and developing the historical, cultural, scenic, and natural resources of the region for the educational and inspirational benefit of current and future generations; and

(5) to provide appropriate linkages between units of the National Park System and communities, governments, and organizations within the National Heritage Area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.**—The term “National Heritage Area” means the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area established in this Act.

(2) **LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—The term “local coordinating entity” means the Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc., which is hereby designated by Congress—

(A) to develop, in partnership with others, the management plan for the National Heritage Area; and

(B) to act as a catalyst for the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in the National Heritage Area.

(3) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the plan prepared by the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Area that specifies actions, policies, strategies, performance goals, and recommendations to meet the goals of the National Heritage Area, in accordance with this Act.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.

(b) **BOUNDARIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The National Heritage Area shall consist of portions of the counties of Santa Cruz and Pima.

(2) **MAP.**—The boundaries of the National Heritage Area shall be as generally depicted on the map titled “Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area”, and numbered T09/80,000, and dated November 13, 2007. The map shall be on file and available to the public in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the local coordinating entity.

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The management plan for the National Heritage Area shall—

(1) describe comprehensive policies, goals, strategies, and recommendations for telling the story of the heritage of the area covered by the National Heritage Area and encouraging long-term resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development of the National Heritage Area;

(2) include a description of actions and commitments that Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, private organizations, and citizens will take to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(3) specify existing and potential sources of funding or economic development strategies to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the National Heritage Area;

(4) include an inventory of the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area related to the national importance and themes of the National Heritage Area that should be protected, enhanced, interpreted, managed, funded, and developed;

(5) recommend policies and strategies for resource management, including the devel-

opment of intergovernmental and inter-agency agreements to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(6) describe a program for implementation for the management plan, including—

(A) performance goals;

(B) plans for resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development; and

(C) specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the local coordinating entity or any Federal, State, Tribal, or local government agency, organization, business, or individual;

(7) include an analysis of, and recommendations for, means by which Federal, State, Tribal, and local programs may best be coordinated (including the role of the National Park Service and other Federal agencies associated with the National Heritage Area) to further the purposes of this Act; and

(8) include a business plan that—

(A) describes the role, operation, financing, and functions of the local coordinating entity and of each of the major activities contained in the management plan; and

(B) provides adequate assurances that the local coordinating entity has the partnerships and financial and other resources necessary to implement the management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to develop the management plan after designation as a National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval.

(2) **TERMINATION OF FUNDING.**—If the management plan is not submitted to the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (1), the local coordinating entity shall not qualify for any additional financial assistance under this Act until such time as the management plan is submitted to and approved by the Secretary.

(c) **APPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **REVIEW.**—Not later than 180 days after receiving the plan, the Secretary shall review and approve or disapprove the management plan for a National Heritage Area on the basis of the criteria established under paragraph (3).

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall consult with the Governor of each State in which the National Heritage Area is located before approving a management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(3) **CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.**—In determining whether to approve a management plan for a National Heritage Area, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(A) the local coordinating entity represents the diverse interests of the National Heritage Area, including Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners;

(B) the local coordinating entity—

(i) has afforded adequate opportunity for public and Federal, State, Tribal, and local governmental involvement (including through workshops and hearings) in the preparation of the management plan; and

(ii) provides for at least semiannual public meetings to ensure adequate implementation of the management plan;

(C) the resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development strategies described in the management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect, enhance, interpret, fund,

manage, and develop the natural, historic, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(D) the management plan would not adversely affect any activities authorized on Federal land under public land laws or land use plans;

(E) the local coordinating entity has demonstrated the financial capability, in partnership with others, to carry out the plan;

(F) the Secretary has received adequate assurances from the appropriate State, Tribal, and local officials whose support is needed to ensure the effective implementation of the State, Tribal, and local elements of the management plan; and

(G) the management plan demonstrates partnerships among the local coordinating entity, Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, regional planning organizations, nonprofit organizations, or private sector parties for implementation of the management plan.

(4) **DISAPPROVAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary disapproves the management plan, the Secretary—

(i) shall advise the local coordinating entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval; and

(ii) may make recommendations to the local coordinating entity for revisions to the management plan.

(B) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than 180 days after receiving a revised management plan, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the revised management plan.

(5) **AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An amendment to the management plan that substantially alters the purposes of the National Heritage Area shall be reviewed by the Secretary and approved or disapproved in the same manner as the original management plan.

(B) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The local coordinating entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to implement an amendment to the management plan until the Secretary approves the amendment.

(6) **AUTHORITIES.**—The Secretary may—

(A) provide technical assistance under the authority of this Act for the development and implementation of the management plan; and

(B) enter into cooperative agreements with interested parties to carry out this Act.

SEC. 6. EVALUATION; REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the National Heritage Area under this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of the National Heritage Area; and

(2) prepare a report in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) **EVALUATION.**—An evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) assess the progress of the local coordinating entity with respect to—

(A) accomplishing the purposes of the authorizing legislation for the National Heritage Area; and

(B) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved management plan for the National Heritage Area;

(2) analyze the Federal, State, Tribal, and local, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to determine the impact of the investments; and

(3) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the National Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the National Heritage Area.

(c) **REPORT.**—Based on the evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary

shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. The report shall include recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the National Heritage Area.

SEC. 7. LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.

(a) DUTIES.—To further the purposes of the National Heritage Area, the Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc., as the local coordinating entity, shall—

(1) prepare a management plan for the National Heritage Area, and submit the management plan to the Secretary, in accordance with this Act;

(2) submit an annual report to the Secretary for each fiscal year for which the local coordinating entity receives Federal funds under this Act, specifying—

(A) the specific performance goals and accomplishments of the local coordinating entity;

(B) the expenses and income of the local coordinating entity;

(C) the amounts and sources of matching funds;

(D) the amounts leveraged with Federal funds and sources of the leveraging; and

(E) grants made to any other entities during the fiscal year;

(3) make available for audit for each fiscal year for which the local coordinating entity receives Federal funds under this Act, all information pertaining to the expenditure of the funds and any matching funds; and

(4) encourage economic viability and sustainability that is consistent with the purposes of the National Heritage Area.

(b) AUTHORITIES.—For the purposes of preparing and implementing the approved management plan for the National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity may use Federal funds made available under this Act to—

(1) make grants to political jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, and other parties within the National Heritage Area;

(2) enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to political jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

(3) hire and compensate staff, including individuals with expertise in—

(A) natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resource conservation;

(B) economic and community development; and

(C) heritage planning;

(4) obtain funds or services from any source, including other Federal programs;

(5) contract for goods or services; and

(6) support activities of partners and any other activities that further the purposes of the National Heritage Area and are consistent with the approved management plan.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The local coordinating entity may not use Federal funds authorized under this Act to acquire any interest in real property.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act affects the authority of a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(b) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on a National Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate the activities with the Secretary and the local coordinating entity to the maximum extent practicable.

(c) OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency;

(2) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of a National Heritage Area; or

(3) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized use of Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

SEC. 9. PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) abridges the rights of any property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the National Heritage Area;

(2) requires any property owner to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, Tribal, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner, or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, Tribal, or local law;

(3) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to any local coordinating entity, including but not necessarily limited to development and management of energy, water, or water-related infrastructure;

(4) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(5) diminishes the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife, including the regulation of fishing and hunting within the National Heritage Area; or

(6) creates any liability, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on the private property.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not more than \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED.—Not more than \$15,000,000 may be appropriated to carry out this Act.

(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act shall be not more than 50 percent; the non-Federal contribution may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

SEC. 11. USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall preclude the local coordinating entity from using Federal funds available under other laws for the purposes for which those funds were authorized.

SEC. 12. SUNSET FOR GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.

The authority of the Secretary to provide financial assistance under this Act terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and in-

clude extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 324 would create the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area. I introduced this legislation on January 8 and am proud that my neighbor in the valley, the gentlelady from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS), is an original cosponsor.

My own history began in the Santa Cruz Valley, at Canoa Ranch where my father worked. My earliest memories are of a life in that extraordinary scenic valley and they comprise an important part of who I am today.

Sharing a border with Mexico, the Santa Cruz Valley encompasses a multitude of cultures, a rich and diverse history, as well as a host of nationally recognized national treasures that are situated within its borders.

The amount of support for this proposal, both in my district and in Ms. GIFFORDS', is astounding. Every county, municipality, tribe, Federal and State park and land management agency within the proposed heritage area, plus a long list of chambers of commerce, tourism organizations, conservation and historic preservation groups, ranchers, farmers and businesses, all support H.R. 324.

The House has already approved this legislation as part of a heritage area package in the last Congress. Mr. Speaker, this bill is important to many of us and to me, to my district, and to Ms. GIFFORDS and to her constituents. I ask my colleagues to support the passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have to rise in opposition to H.R. 324. As many of us have discovered, the National Heritage Area program, although well intended, is not a new program and has no established framework. Many of our colleagues have sought to ensure that despite a lack of guidance, heritage areas would include basic property rights protections. Unfortunately, this bill does not have sufficient protection for the property owners within the boundaries of this area, and it is likely many of them have no idea that they are to be included.

To remedy this problem, we request, and we have requested in the past, that the bill be amended to allow property owners the opportunity to remove their property from the heritage area.

While the current language allows owners to "refrain from participation," nothing changes the fact that this bill places them within a new Federal designation that provides a basis for ambitious Federal land managers to claim that they now have a mandate and millions of Federal dollars to interfere with local decisions affecting their neighbors' property.

Three years ago, this point was brought to the forefront when my

friend, the sponsor of this legislation, authored legislation to reduce the size of the Yuma Crossing Heritage Area. When that heritage area was established in 2000, it was much larger than local farmers were expecting. Further exacerbating the problem, local zoning bureaucrats began to use the heritage area boundaries in planning.

Because the language designating the heritage area included no recourse for property owners who wanted out, or who never wanted to be included in the heritage area in the first place, their only option was to come to Congress to adjust the boundary and solve the zoning assault that they faced. We must not make that mistake again.

Complicating this particular proposed heritage area is the inclusion of some of the most heavily traveled human and narcotics trafficking routes in our country. We have already seen what happens when we lock up Federal border lands within Federal wilderness areas. The cartels run rampant knowing that Border Patrol is hamstrung by draconian rules making them subservient to land managers and the accompanying bureaucratic red tape. Now is not the time to place yet another layer of Federal interference over this region. The border lands are far from secure.

I urge my colleagues to support private property rights and the effort to secure the border by opposing H.R. 324.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, every time we bring up a national heritage proposal, we hear concerns expressed about private property protections. We should be clear that during the 20-plus years of this program's existence, opponents have not been able to identify a single instance in which someone has been deprived of the use of their property as a result of this designation.

Tens of millions of Americans in States across the country have lived, worked and recreated and made their living within a heritage area. Despite the best efforts of opponents of these designations, they have never found a case where property rights were violated.

The Government Accountability Office even investigated potential property rights violations and found none. Nevertheless, this bill contains extensive private property provisions. These private property protections are the same language approved by Congress in earlier bills and signed into law by both the Obama and Bush administrations. If the problem existed, the bill has the language necessary to take care of it.

The other issue, in terms of law enforcement, this designation in no way restricts local, county, State or national law enforcement from carrying out its enforcement mission and its responsibility to uphold the law. There is no restriction, no impediment, and no redesignation of their mission. The mission continues. The heritage area in no way hinders or prohibits that mission from going on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to inquire if there are any additional speakers at this point from the majority, and if not, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 324.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND LAND CONVEYANCES

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1858) to provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyances involving Roosevelt National Forest, Colorado, to correct the effects of an erroneous land survey that resulted in approximately 7 acres of the Crystal Lakes Subdivision, Ninth Filing, encroaching on National Forest System land, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND LAND CONVEYANCES, ROOSEVELT NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO.

(a) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundaries of Roosevelt National Forest, Colorado, are hereby modified to exclude from the national forest a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 7 acres within the Crystal Lakes Subdivision as depicted on the map entitled "Crystal Lakes Encroachment, HR 3299" and dated July 15, 2008.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LAND REMOVED FROM NATIONAL FOREST.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use the authority provided by Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the Small Tracts Act; 16 U.S.C. 521c-521i) to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property excluded from the boundaries of Roosevelt National Forest under subsection (a) to the landowners whose real property adjoins the excluded land and who, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, occupy the excluded land.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—The conveyances required by subsection (b) shall be made without consideration.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land excluded from the boundaries of Roosevelt National Forest under subsection (a) and conveyed under subsection (b) shall be

determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) CANCELLATION OF PORTION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCE IN FLREA SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The amount available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the unobligated balance in the special account established for the Forest Service under section 807 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6806) is reduced by a total of \$200,000, and the amount so reduced is hereby cancelled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1858, introduced by Representative BETSY MARKEY of Colorado, would provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyances involving the Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado to correct the effects of erroneous land survey. The bill responds to an ongoing boundary dispute between the Forest Service and private land owners with property adjacent to the forest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague, Representative MARKEY, for her work on this bill. As a freshman, she has demonstrated remarkable ability to get things done on behalf of her constituents. I ask my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1858.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill provides a legislative solution for a number of homeowners in Larimer County, Colorado, who own real property adjacent to the Roosevelt National Forest. These homeowners have occupied or improved their property in good faith and in reliance on 1975 land surveys.

It was introduced in the last Congress by Congresswoman Marilyn Musgrave. It is needed to resolve the issue fairly because a recent Forest Service resurvey now claims that a small portion of Roosevelt National Forest is occupied by these adjacent landowners.

This bill conveys approximately 7 acres occupied by the affected landowners to those landowners, and I support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me yield as much time as she may consume to the sponsor of the legislation, Representative MARKEY.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1858 and for private property rights.

Imagine for a moment that the Federal Government sent you a notification that you need to repurchase land that you have owned for over 30 years. This is exactly what happened to landowners in the Crystal Lakes subdivision on the border of the Roosevelt National Forest.

When the Crystal Lakes subdivision was developed in 1975, an inaccurate land survey resulted in a 7-acre overlap with the U.S. Forest Service land. In 2006, the Crystal Lakes landowners were notified that parts of their property were on Federal land, and they would be required to purchase this land at current market price from the Forest Service.

It is simply unacceptable in these tough economic times to penalize the Crystal Lakes landowners for a mistake made through no fault of their own and a mistake the Federal Government has waited for over 30 years to rectify. The current property value is, without question, higher than it was at the time of the sale in the 1970s and 1980s.

If forced to repurchase their land, some landowners may be in danger of foreclosure. These property owners have bought their land in good faith and have been paying taxes on that land.

While I support the national forest system and the need to preserve land in the West for future generations, for the Federal Government to ask these landowners to repurchase land they have owned for decades stands against reason.

Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1858 today to adjust the boundaries of the Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado. With your vote, we can ensure the landowners in Crystal Lakes will be able to remain on their land.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Colorado for bringing this bill. She is building on the good work that was begun by her predecessor, Congresswoman Marilyn Musgrave. This is a bill that I would urge all of my colleagues to support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1858, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HALE SCOUTS ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 310) to provide for the conveyance of approximately 140 acres of land in the Ouachita National Forest in Okla-

homa to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 310

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Help to Access Land for the Education of Scouts" or "HALE Scouts Act".

SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE, OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST, OKLAHOMA.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is in the public interest to provide for the sale of certain federally owned land in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America, for market value consideration.

(b) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, by quitclaim deed, to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America (in this section referred to as the "Council") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain National Forest System land in the Ouachita National Forest in the State of Oklahoma consisting of approximately 140 acres, depending on the final measurement of the road set back and the actual size of the affected sections, as more fully described in subsection (c). The conveyance may not include any land located within the Indian Nations National Scenic and Wildlife Area designated by section 10 of the Winding Stair Mountain National Recreation and Wilderness Area Act (16 U.S.C. 460vv–8).

(c) COVERED LANDS.—The National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (b) is depicted on the map entitled "Boy Scout Land Request—Ouachita NF". The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Forest Service Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia.

(d) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (b), the Council shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary and done in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(e) USE OF PROCEEDS.—The consideration received under subsection (d) shall be deposited in the fund established by Public Law 90–171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act"; 16 U.S.C. 484a). The amount so deposited shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, for expenditure for the acquisition of land and interests in land in the Ouachita National Forest.

(f) SURVEY AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (b) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The Council shall pay the reasonable costs of survey, appraisal, and any administrative analyses required by law.

(g) ACCESS.—Access to the land conveyed under subsection (b) shall be from the adjacent land of the Council or its successor. Notwithstanding section 1323(a) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3210(a)), the Secretary shall not be required to provide additional access to the conveyed land.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such terms and conditions on the conveyance under subsection (b) as the Secretary considers in the public interest, including the reservation of

access rights to the conveyed land for administrative purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 310 would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey 140 acres of public land in Oklahoma administered by the United States Forest Service to the Indian Nations Council of Boy Scouts of America. The Boy Scouts will use the land to expand their existing camping area and will pay fair market value for the land.

H.R. 310 is identical to legislation that passed the House last year by a vote of 370–2.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague, Representative BOREN, for his work on this legislation, and I urge our colleagues to support passage of H.R. 310.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The majority has explained this bill well. We are pleased to support this legislation also, which will help the young men of Oklahoma by allowing the Boy Scouts to expand their summer camp within the national forest to accommodate the fast-growing number of campers. This speaks volumes about the excellent organization that is the Boy Scouts of America.

□ 1445

I strongly support this legislation, and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this measure, H.R. 310, the HALE Scouts Act, granting the U.S. Forest Service authority to sell roughly 140 acres of land to the Indian Nations Council of Boy Scouts, which is adjacent to the Scout's summer camp, Camp Tom Hale located in Tahlequah, OK. The Indian Nations Council of Boy Scouts is a non-profit organization providing educational programs for boys and young adults to build character, to train in the responsibilities of citizenship, and to develop personal fitness.

Camp Tom Hale first opened in June 1930 to serve Boy Scouts in the McAlester, Oklahoma area. It was originally located at what is now Robbers Cave State Park near Wilburton, Oklahoma. In 1963, the Boy Scout Council in McAlester worked with the State of Oklahoma and the U.S. Forest Service to exchange the camp at Robbers Cave for 480 acres of wilderness area in the Ouachita National Forest.

This "new" Camp Hale has continued as a summer adventure camp serving thousands of scouts during the intervening 41 years.

In 1997, the Council board developed a strategic plan for a \$3.5 million expansion and renovation of the camp. Since then, the Council has spent in excess of \$1 million continually updating and expanding facilities to meet the needs of scouts. As a result, a renewed emphasis on wilderness and the outdoors has flourished, with over 6000 scouts and leaders from a five state area attending weekly sessions offered in June and July and enjoying the beautiful Ouachita Forest.

Attendance has now exceeded the maximum number of available campsites and program areas, which is causing Camp Hale to begin turning away hundreds of scouts each summer. It is now critical for camp growth that the boundaries be extended to include more area for camping and additional program & training services. Successful completion of this objective will allow the Boy Scouts to continue the expansion of outdoor & leadership training for thousands of youth living in the Central Southwest and bring additional usage and enjoyment of the Ouachita Forest to more families.

It is for the benefit of these thousands of young Oklahomans that I proudly sponsored this measure. I greatly appreciate this House's consideration of this bill, and would like to urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3123.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL REMEDIATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3123) to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to remedy problems caused by a collapsed drainage tunnel in Leadville, Colorado, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3123

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL REMEDIATION.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel Remediation Act of 2009".

(b) **TUNNEL REMEDIATION.**—The Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment

Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-575) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking section 705.

(2) In section 708(a)—

(A) by striking "(a)" and inserting "(a)(1)";

(B) by striking "The Secretary shall have" and inserting "Except as provided by paragraph (2), the Secretary shall have"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) The Secretary shall participate in the implementation of the operable unit 6 remedy for the California Gulch Superfund Site, including, but not limited to, the following actions:

"(A) Treating water behind any blockage or bulkhead in the Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel, including surface water diverted into the Tunnel workings as part of the remedy.

"(B) Managing and maintaining the mine pool behind such blockage or bulkhead at a level that precludes surface runoff and releases and minimizes the potential for tunnel failure due to excessive water pressure in the tunnel."

(3) In section 708(f), by striking "and 708" and inserting ", 708, and 709".

(4) By adding at the end of title VII the following:

"SEC. 709. TUNNEL MAINTENANCE.

"The Secretary shall take such steps to repair or maintain the structural integrity of the Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel (LMDT) as may be necessary in order to prevent tunnel failure and to preclude uncontrolled release of water from any portion of the tunnel."

(5) In the table of sections contained in section 2—

(A) by striking the item relating to section 705; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 708 the following new item:

"Sec. 709. Tunnel maintenance."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3123, introduced by our colleague Representative LAMBORN, will direct the Bureau of Reclamation to remedy problems caused by collapses in the Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel. Due to structural deterioration, contaminated water has backed up in the tunnel, posing a public health and environmental threat.

I ask my colleagues to support the bill's passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following exchange of letters between the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure concerning H.R. 3123.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, September 8, 2009.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL: I write to you regarding H.R. 3123, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remedy problems caused by a collapsed drainage tunnel in Leadville, Colorado.

H.R. 3123 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I agree to waive consideration of this bill with the mutual understanding that my decision to forego a sequential referral of the bill does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 3123.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the appointment of conferees on H.R. 3123 or similar legislation.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House Floor.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2009.

Hon. JAMES OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your willingness to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 3123, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remedy problems caused by a collapsed drainage tunnel in Leadville, Colorado.

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 3123, notwithstanding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am
Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL, II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel was

originally constructed by the Federal Bureau of Mines in the forties and fifties to facilitate the extraction of lead and zinc ore for the World War II and Korean War efforts. The Bureau of Reclamation acquired the tunnel in 1959, hoping to use it as a source of water for the Frying Pan, Arkansas, project. Although the tunnel was never used for that project, water that flows out of the tunnel is considered part of the natural flow of the Arkansas River.

With the passage and subsequent signing into law of H.R. 429 during the 102nd Congress in 1992, the Bureau of Reclamation constructed and continues to operate a water treatment plant at the mouth of the tunnel. Groundwater levels at the tunnel have fluctuated in recent years. In addition, a collapse inside the tunnel has increased the tunnel's mine pool significantly, leading to new seeps and springs in the area. Estimates suggest that at one time, up to 1 billion gallons of water may have built up within the mine pool.

In November 2007, the EPA sent a letter to the Bureau of Reclamation expressing concerns over a catastrophic blowout, and in February 2008 the Lake County Commissioners declared a state of emergency.

Emergency measures are currently being undertaken by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Bureau of Reclamation to relieve water pressure in the vicinity. Their success has been notable to date. However, many of the problems reported at this site are not new. Legislation addressing this matter and authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to rehabilitate its tunnel dates back to at least 1976.

In response to the request for action from the local community, I have again worked together in a bipartisan manner with Senator MARK UDALL from Colorado and reintroduced H.R. 3123. This bill would direct the Bureau of Reclamation to relieve water pressure behind certain blockages in the tunnel, permanently manage the mine pool behind any blockage to prevent releases of contaminated water, and manage the tunnel in such a way to prevent failure of the structure.

I look forward to seeing this situation remedied so that concerns about human safety and environmental integrity may be appropriately and responsibly addressed. I remind Members that only minor technical changes have been made since the bill was originally passed by the House of Representatives in the previous Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3123, as amended

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BISHOP MUSEUM'S HISTORIC HAWAIIAN HALL

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 541) recognizing and honoring the restoration and renovation of the Bishop Museum's historic Hawaiian Hall, the Nation's premier showcase for Hawaiian culture and history, on the occasion of the Museum's 120th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 541

Whereas the Bishop Museum was founded in 1889 in Honolulu, Hawai'i, by Charles Reed Bishop in memory of his beloved wife, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the great granddaughter of Kamehameha I, to house the personal legacies and bequests of the royal Kamehameha and Kalākaua families;

Whereas the mission of the Bishop Museum since its inception is to study, preserve, and tell the stories of the cultures and natural history of Hawai'i and the Pacific Ocean;

Whereas the Bishop Museum's collections include some 24,000,000 objects, collectively the largest Hawai'i and Pacific area collection in the world, including over 1,200,000 cultural objects representing Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islands, and Hawai'i immigrant life, more than 125,000 historical publications including many in the Hawaiian language, 1,000,000 historical photographs, films, works of art, audio recordings, and manuscripts, and over 22,000,000 plant and animal specimens;

Whereas a primary goal of the Bishop Museum is to serve and represent the interests of Native Hawaiians by advancing Native Hawaiian culture and education, protecting the collections and increasing access to such collections, and strengthening the Museum's connections with the schools of Hawai'i;

Whereas the national significance of the Bishop Museum's cultural collection lies in the Native Hawaiian collection, which collectively represents the largest public resource in the world documenting a unique way of life and a source of knowledge and inspiration for numerous visitors, researchers, students, Native Hawaiian craftsmen, teachers, community, and spiritual leaders over the years, especially since the Hawaiian cultural revival, which has been steadily growing and gaining in popularity in recent years;

Whereas over 300,000 people visit the Bishop Museum each year to learn about Hawaiian culture and experience Hawaiian Hall;

Whereas the primary reason for visiting the Bishop Museum, given by an average of 400,000 visitors each year, is their desire to see Hawaiian Hall and to learn about Hawaiian culture;

Whereas Hawaiian Hall is the Nation's only showcase of its size, proportions, design, and historic context that is devoted to the magnificent legacy of Hawai'i's kings and queens, and the legacies of its Native Hawaiian people of all walks of life and ages;

Whereas Hawaiian Hall, one of three interconnected structures known as the Hawaiian Hall Complex and constructed between 1889 and 1903, is considered a masterpiece of late Victorian museum design with its Kamehameha blue stone exterior quarried on site and extensive use of Native koa wood, and is one of the few examples of Romanesque Richardsonian-style museum buildings to have survived basically unchanged;

Whereas Hawaiian Hall, designed by noted Hawai'i architects C.B. Ripley and C.W. Dickey in 1898, was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982 based on its unique combination of architectural, cultural, scientific, educational, and historical significance;

Whereas the restoration and renovation of Hawaiian Hall and its exhibits, conducted by noted Hawai'i architect Glenn Mason and noted national and international museum exhibit designer Ralph Appelbaum, is integral to the Bishop Museum's ability to fulfill its mission and achieve its primary goal of serving and representing the interests of Native Hawaiians;

Whereas the restoration and renovation of Hawaiian Hall, commenced in 2005, included the building of a new gathering place in an enclosed, glass walled atrium, improved access through the installation of an elevator in the new atrium to all three floors of the Hall and other buildings in the Hawaiian Hall Complex, improved collection preservation through the installation of new, state of the art environmental controls, lighting, security, and fire suppression systems, and restored original woodwork and metalwork;

Whereas the restoration and renovation of the Hawaiian Hall's exhibits brings multiple voices and a Native Hawaiian perspective to bear on the Bishop Museum's treasures by conveying the essential values, beliefs, complexity, and achievements of Hawaiian culture through exquisite and fragile artifacts in a setting that emphasizes their mana (power and essence) and the place in which such artifacts were created;

Whereas the new exhibit incorporates contemporary Native Hawaiian artwork illustrating traditional stories, legends, and practices, and contemporary Native Hawaiian voices interpreting the practices and traditions through multiple video presentations;

Whereas the new exhibit features over 2,000 objects and images from the Bishop Museum's collections on the open floor, mezzanines, and the center space conceptually organized to represent three traditional realms or wao of the Hawaiian world—Kai Akea, the expansive sea from which gods and people came, Wao Kānaka, the realm of people, and Wao Lani, the realm of gods and the ali'i, or chiefs, who descended from them;

Whereas the new exhibit's ending display celebrates the strength, glory, and achievements of Native Hawaiians with a large 40-panel mural titled Ho'ohuli, To Cause An Overturning, A Change, made by students of Native Hawaiian charter schools in collaboration with Native Hawaiian artists and other students, and interpreted by Native Hawaiian artists and teachers in a video presentation; and

Whereas the people of the United States wish to convey their sincerest appreciation to the Bishop Museum for its service and devotion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the reopening of historic Hawaiian Hall on the 120th anniversary of the

founding of the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, Hawai'i; and

(2) honors and praises the Bishop Museum, on the occasion of its reopening and 120th anniversary, for its work to ensure the preservation, study, education, and appreciation of Native Hawaiian culture and history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the Bishop Museum was founded in 1889 in Honolulu, Hawaii, and for 120 years has served as the Nation's preeminent resource documenting, preserving and educating others on Native Hawaiian culture. The museum's collection of 24 million objects is the largest Hawaiian and Pacific Island collection in the world. Over 2,000 of these objects and images are on display in the newly renovated Hawaiian Hall.

H. Res. 541, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Representative NEIL ABERCROMBIE, would express the appreciation of the House of Representatives to the Bishop Museum for 120 years of service to the people of Hawaii and the United States. We commend Representative ABERCROMBIE for his tireless efforts on behalf of his constituents and the preservation of Hawaiian history and culture.

We support passage of House Resolution 541 and urge its adoption in the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution has been explained well by the majority. We have no objection.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 541, recognizing and honoring the restoration and renovation of the Bishop Museum's Historic Hawaiian Hall, the Nation's premier showcase for Hawaiian culture and history, on the occasion of the Museum's 120th anniversary.

I thank the gentleman from the State of Hawaii, my good friend, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for his leadership on this important issue. I also want to thank Chairman RAHALL of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this resolution for House floor consideration.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 541 conveys our sincerest appreciation to the Bishop Museum for its service and devotion. Founded in 1889 by Charles Reed Bishop in memory of his beloved wife, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the great granddaughter of Kamehameha I, the Bishop Museum is essential to study, pre-

serve and tell the stories of the cultures and natural history of Hawaii and the Pacific Ocean.

Collectively, the Museum houses the largest Hawaii and Pacific area collection in the world, including 1,200,000 cultural objects representing Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islands, and Hawaii immigrant life, more than 125,000 historical publications including many in the Hawaiian language, 1,000,000 historical photographs, films, works of art, audio recordings, and manuscripts and over 22,000,000 plant and animal specimens. This cultural collection creates a significantly important public resource for academic studies and for public information.

Not only that, the Bishop Museum is also very significant because of the fact that it houses the Hawaiian Hall, the Nation's only showcase of its size, proportions, design, and historical context that is devoted to the magnificent legacy of Hawaii's kings and queens, and the legacies of its Native Hawaiian people of all walks of life and ages. Over the years lead paint and termite damage rendered the building unable to meet modern standards and requirements for any museum until in 2005, the restoration and renovation of the Hawaiian Hall commenced. Multiple parties came together to collaborate in this effort. The museum was redefined conceptually as well as given physical reconstruction. The end product stands as testament to the efforts of all those involved.

The new exhibit incorporates Native Hawaiian artwork depicting traditional stories, legends, and practices, and contemporary Native Hawaiian voices interpreting the practices and traditions through multiple video presentations. In addition, the new exhibit is conceptually organized to represent three traditional realms or wao of the Hawaiian world including: Kai Akea—the expansive sea from which gods and people came; Wao Kanaka—the realm of people; and Wao Lani—the realm of gods and the alii or chiefs, who descended from them. The new exhibit even includes a large 40-panel mural which celebrates the strength, glory, and achievements of Native Hawaiians.

Mr. Speaker, the Bishop Museum is very important to the Native Hawaiians, especially in their efforts to revive their culture and their Hawaiian traditions. I congratulate the Bishop Museum on its 120th anniversary and for its service and devotion, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H. Res. 541.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 541, recognizing and honoring the restoration and renovation of the Bishop Museum's historic Hawaiian Hall, the Nation's premier showcase for Hawaiian culture and history, on the occasion of the Museum's 120th anniversary.

Founded more than a century ago, in the memory of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop by her husband, Charles Reed Bishop, Bishop Museum has contributed to the world's understanding of the natural and cultural history of the Pacific and Hawai'i. It has collected and preserved nearly 25 million scientific animal and plant specimens and 2.4 million cultural objects that together help tell the full story of Hawai'i and the Pacific.

I attended the celebration of the Bishop Museum's 120th anniversary in Honolulu during our August district work period. The magnificent historic Hawaiian Hall has been beautifully restored and now serves as a more fit-

ting setting for the irreplaceable and precious cultural and historical artifacts it showcases. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, Bishop Museum's Hawaiian Hall has traditionally housed Hawaii's most sacred and beloved artifacts. With its volcanic stone exterior and extensive use of native koa wood, Hawaiian Hall is considered a masterwork of late Victorian museum design.

With this important renovation, hundreds of thousand visitors and local residents will enter the world of Hawai'i. They will hear the oral tradition of oli and mo'olelo. They will experience Hawai'i's deep connection between its natural and cultural worlds. Bishop Museum has served as an essential repository and education institution for over a century.

I urge my colleagues to join me voting for H. Res. 451 and encourage you to visit the restored Hawaiian Hall when you next visit Hawaii.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 541.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HISTORIC VIRGINIA KEY BEACH PARK OF MIAMI, FLORIDA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 361) recognizing the historical significance of Historic Virginia Key Beach Park of Miami, Florida, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 361

Whereas in the early 1900s, Historic Virginia Key Beach Park of Miami, Florida, was frequented by African-American and Caribbean settlers arriving by ferry from mainland South Florida;

Whereas in the summer of 1945, on the beach at Baker's Haulover County Park, a group of black men led by then attorney Lawson E. Thomas staged a protest against the unjust segregation laws that prohibited black people from using the public beaches in South Florida;

Whereas in response to the protest, county officials designated Virginia Key Beach Park as the "Colored Beach", a segregated beach site for the African-American community which opened on August 1, 1945;

Whereas, even after civil rights laws opened all the public beaches in South Florida to people of all races and ethnicities, Virginia Key Beach Park remained a popular destination for many in the African-American community for several decades;

Whereas in 1979, the site was transferred from the county to the City of Miami with the stipulation that the beach be kept open

and maintained as a public park and recreation area;

Whereas in 1982, citing the high cost of maintenance and operations, the City of Miami closed Virginia Key Beach Park shortly after assuming its responsibility;

Whereas in 1990, the City of Miami Commission responded to citizen outcry and established the Virginia Key Beach Park Trust (hereafter referred to as the "Trust") to restore, reopen, and preserve the site for public use;

Whereas the late M. Athalie Range, an African-American community leader and the first woman to sit on the City of Miami Commission, worked with the community to save Virginia Key Beach Park from the grasp of developers, and deliver it back to the people. She lobbied to place the property on the National Register of Historic Places, spearheaded funding for a multi-billion dollar restoration program, and planned a new museum/cultural center that would one day, impart the message of social equality and responsible citizenry for future generations;

Whereas in June 2002, the Trust successfully petitioned Federal and State government officials to place the site on the National Register of Historic Places and give it a Florida Historical Marker;

Whereas in 2003, the Dade Community Foundation established the Historic Virginia Key Beach Park Trust Fund to collect charitable donations to help restore and preserve the park; and

Whereas on February 22, 2008, after extensive renovation by the Trust, Historic Virginia Key Beach Park celebrated its grand re-opening for public use by the entire community with a ribbon cutting ceremony and community concert: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the extraordinary historical, cultural, and recreational significance of Historic Virginia Key Beach Park of Miami, Florida;

(2) recommit its attempt to protect and preserve American history through national parks and historic sites; and

(3) acknowledges the significance of the African-American community's struggle for equality through its collaborative efforts to preserve this historic site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, in 1945 a group of black men, led by Lawson E. Thomas, courageously protested the banning of African Americans from the public beaches of south Florida. As a result, Virginia Key Beach Park was established as a "Colored Beach" under the segregation laws that persisted throughout the civil rights movement.

The park was transferred to the city of Miami in 1979, which attempted to close it three years later, citing a lack

of operating funds. Since then, dedicated community leaders have fought to not only keep the park open, but also add it to the National Register of Historic Places and establish a trust to manage it.

With this resolution, sponsored by Representative ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, the House of Representatives recognizes the historic significance of the site and honors the African American struggle for equality represented there.

I ask my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In the 1920s, Virginia Key Beach, located about 2 miles south of Miami, Florida, became the area's public beach that was used primarily by African Americans. In 1945, Dade County officials designated the beach as a legally segregated beach for use by the African American community. Today, the beach is managed by the Virginia Key Beach Park Trust and is owned by the City of Miami.

This resolution recognizes the historical significance of Virginia Key Beach Park. I congratulate Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN for her work, and I urge passage of this resolution.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, my good friend, Mr. LAMBORN, for the time, and I also thank Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona. Thank you so much for bringing this resolution before us today.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 361, which is a bipartisan bill recognizing the national significance of historic Virginia Key Beach Park, which is located in my congressional district in south Florida. I also would like to thank my dear friends and fellow south Floridians, my colleagues, Representatives KENDRICK MEEK, ALCEE HASTINGS, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their support of this legislation.

A segregated beach during the 1900s, Virginia Key Beach Park serves as a reminder of our Nation's struggle for equality and justice for all members of our society. During World War II, the beach was a training ground for African American soldiers serving in the United States Army. Shortly following the war's end, the beach was established as the only public beach open to the African American community. In the 1950s, the beach played a prominent role in south Florida's efforts to desegregate during the civil rights movement.

In the years following desegregation, leaders of the African American community in south Florida, including the influential and late wonderful leader in our area, Athalie Range, fought tirelessly to preserve this unique site.

Today's resolution serves as a tribute to Athalie Range and to so many Afri-

can American pioneers, including our former colleague, Congresswoman Carrie Meek, who authored a bill in 2001 to include Virginia Key Beach Park into the National Park System. I was honored to work with Carrie in her quest to include this beach in the National Park System, and years later I am joined by her beloved son KENDRICK in honoring the importance of this historic and often overlooked site.

I thank Congressman GRIJALVA for the time, and I thank my dear friend Mr. LAMBORN for the time to talk about this historic part of south Florida history.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate the gentlelady from Florida for the resolution.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 361, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

AKRON VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2004) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4282 Beach Street in Akron, Michigan, as the "Akron Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2004

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AKRON VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4282 Beach Street in Akron, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the "Akron Veterans Memorial Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Akron Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H.R. 2004 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States postal facility located as 4282 Beach Street in Akron, Michigan, as the Akron Veterans Memorial Post Office.

Introduced by my colleague, Representative DALE KILDEE of Michigan, on April 21, 2009, and favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by unanimous consent on June 18, 2009, H.R. 2004 enjoys the support of the entire House Michigan delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us pays tribute to the brave men and women from Akron Village, the State of Michigan, and across the United States who have served our Nation in the United States military, both at home and abroad. Over 23 million American military veterans are currently living in the United States, including approximately 742,000 living in the State of Michigan alone. They, as well as those that are no longer with us, have devoted their lives to the defense and security of our Nation, and always at a great personal risk and sacrifice. We are eternally in their debt and forever grateful for their noble and selfless dedication to our Nation and the preservation of its founding principles.

Mr. Speaker, let us pay tribute to the distinguished service of our veterans from the village of Akron, the State of Michigan, and across the country by designating the Akron post office in their honor.

I urge my colleagues to me in supporting H.R. 2004.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of the renaming of the Akron, Michigan post office. From its humble beginnings on July 23, 1857, this post office has been part of the community in small town Michigan. Rather noteworthy, Mr. KILDEE has chosen a rather unusual naming for a post office, and one that I wholeheartedly support. This post office is not named after one brave American or one now-departed politician. Instead, it's named after the countless thousands of men and women of Michigan who have served in the Armed Forces or are serving today and deserve our respect as veterans.

I would urge support of this, and I would urge all of my colleagues to take note that this post office represents a symbol of service more than the symbol of any one person.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I again urge my colleagues to join me in honoring America's military veterans through the passage of H.R. 2004.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill H.R. 2004, which would des-

ignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4282 Beach Street in Akron, Michigan, as the "Akron Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The Akron Post Office was first established at the house of its first postmaster, Samuel B. Covey. At the beginning of the Civil War, the post office was moved to the home of Lucius Waldo, about 7 miles south west of Unionville, Michigan, and relocated to Akron village in 1882.

As the only Federal office in the town of Akron, Michigan, this facility should have the honor of recognizing all of the brave men and women who have served our country in uniform.

It has long been a goal of mine to honor all veterans. As a father of two sons, both of whom served as captains in the United States Army, I am a firm believer that our Nation owes an immense debt of gratitude to its armed forces veterans.

That is why I will continue to advocate for America's most important obligation, caring for its defenders and honoring them for their service.

Designating this facility will provide citizens with the opportunity to be mindful of the sacrifices our armed forces' veterans have made, and continue to make today.

I would like to thank the entire Michigan delegation for their support on this legislation and urge my colleagues support in passing this legislation.

Ms. WATSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2004.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HATCH ACT REFORM ACT OF 2009

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1345) to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the "Hatch Act".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1345

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Hatch Act Reform Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO BE SUBJECT TO THE SAME RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS APPLY TO STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 1501(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "a State or territory" and inserting "a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory".

(b) PROVISIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES MADE INAPPLICABLE.—Section 7322(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting "or" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(3) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(4) by striking "services;" and inserting "services or an individual employed or holding office in the government of the District of Columbia;".

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act—

(1) shall take effect on the effective date of a law, enacted by the government of the District of Columbia after the date of the enactment of this Act, which places restrictions on political activities of employees of the government of the District of Columbia; and

(2) shall apply with respect to actions occurring on or after the effective date referred to in paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise for the consideration of H.R. 1345, which is designed to ensure that employees of the District of Columbia are subject to the same rules of political activity under the Hatch Act that apply to all other State and local government employees, thereby ending the discriminatory treatment they have received since 1993.

In October of 1993, Congress passed the Hatch Act Reform Amendments, allowing Federal employees to take part in political campaigns on their off-duty, personal time. The legislation of 1993 did continue to prohibit Federal employees from seeking public office in partisan elections. However, it also retained a measure which subjected D.C. employees to Federal Hatch Act provisions. This ignored the District's authority to self-govern and enact its own local laws; not to mention that employees in all other State and local jurisdictions are subjected to laws written by their own State and local governments and are not subject to the Federal Hatch Act like D.C. government employees. H.R. 1345 ends this disparate treatment by placing D.C. employees under the same Federal Hatch Act restrictions that apply to all other States and localities.

This bill was offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) on March 5, 2009. Having been considered by the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, chaired

by Representative STEPHEN LYNCH, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform under Chairman TOWNS ordered the bill reported to the full House by voice vote on June 4, 2009.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1345 is a common-sense measure, treating employees of the District of Columbia the same way that other State and local government employees are treated. The difference in treatment under the Hatch Act has persisted for far too long. I urge my colleagues to help end the disparate treatment by supporting this measure.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill authored by ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON that is, in fact, timely or perhaps beyond its time. This was passed by our committee on a voice vote and is supported by all members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, home rule by the District of Columbia will not be complete until we harmonize as many rights and responsibilities as we can to the District. Our committee is dedicated to do that harmonization, to look for inequities, either by too much or too little, much of it well-intended in the past, some of it even needed in the past. But as the District of Columbia takes on its immediate responsibilities, we must also treat it appropriately and not have it governed by special rules. This narrowly constructed change will, in fact, cause the Hatch Act to be identical in the way it is implemented throughout the country, being implemented toward the District of Columbia. I think every American appreciates that if you lived in a city in Maryland or in a city in Virginia, you would have the same expectation of the rules of national governance as you should have here in the Nation's capital if you're involved in similar activity.

□ 1515

For that reason, on a bipartisan basis, we support this simple but technically necessary fix.

I reserve my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the distinguished Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON from the great District of Columbia recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. First off, Mr. Speaker, may I thank the gentlewoman from California for her work on this bill and for managing this bill as well and explaining it to the House.

I'm very grateful to the ranking member of the full committee for his work on this bill and his cooperation in helping us to move this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing more or nothing less than a holdover from the old pre-Home Rule days in the District of Columbia. The Congress passed the Home Rule Act and intended that local laws would be a matter for the District of Columbia, and somehow, this got

left out of the mix. And the OPM, the Office of Personnel Management, and its council's office has been vexed—that's the only word for it—vexed by these complaints that these sometimes come and sometimes don't.

For example, advisory neighborhood commissioners, peculiar to the District of Columbia, are "elected officials." They're unpaid. If you look at the council of the District of Columbia, almost all of them were advisory neighborhood commissioners. But somehow, people bring complaints against them when they run for office because they're not regarded in Federal law as elected officials. They're elected officials; unpaid, but they're elected officials. They run for office. Those are not matters that you would expect a Federal regulatory agency to pay any attention to. And I don't want the OPM, in fact, spending the time of its special council on the arcane laws of the District of Columbia.

What this law says is you, D.C., will have to have your own Hatch Act. The Hatch Act was one of the great reforms in government. Perhaps there's no reform ever in government that's been more important than the Hatch Act. This bill can't go into effect until the District of Columbia has its own Hatch Act for its own local law, the way California and all the States of the Union have their own version of the Hatch Act. As I heard the ranking member say, When you're getting Federal money and you're involved in Federal matters—and often matters in the State are Federal matters—the Hatch Act applies as always.

When you're dealing in D.C. with D.C. management, you need your own Hatch Act, and you need OPM to deal with the often more serious matters that affect the Federal Government when millions of dollars may be involved in Hatch Act violations.

I want to thank my good friends from California, both of them, for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Hatch Act Reform Act of 2009 eliminates anomalous treatment of the District of Columbia which, alone among U.S. jurisdictions, still falls under the Federal Hatch Act as an uncorrected left-over provision from before the Congress made the District an independent jurisdiction that today enacts its own local laws. Fortunately, the House recognized that the present Federal Hatch Act jurisdiction over the District was inappropriate and obsolete and removed this Federal responsibility several years ago, but the Senate failed to act. H.R. 1345 will eliminate the double indignity of placing a local burden on the Federal Government while depriving the District of a responsibility that only local jurisdictions familiar with local laws can be expected to handle appropriately. H.R. 1345 retains Federal Hatch Act authority concerning prohibited partisan and political activity that applies to every State and locality upon receipt of Federal funds or functions, and importantly, requires the District to enact its own local version of the Hatch Act barring similar local violations before H.R. 1345 can become effective. Local Hatch Act violations in the Dis-

trict are rare, but the District needs its own Hatch Act to fully account and be responsible for local violations, with which only a local, objective body would be familiar.

H.R. 1345 leaves in place the Federal Hatch Act restrictions that apply to other jurisdictions on the use of official authority, specifically as it relates to elections; the solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of political campaign contributions; the prohibitions on running for public office in partisan elections; and the use of on-duty time and resources to engage in partisan campaign activity when Federal funds or responsibilities are involved. My bill would remove only the Federal Hatch Act jurisdiction that applies to the District of Columbia and would require the District to enact its own local Hatch Act, similar to those in other jurisdictions, instead of requiring the Federal Office of Personnel Management, OPM, and its Special Counsel to devote staff time and other resources to investigation, fact-finding and judgment of unfamiliar local matters.

In fact, OPM has asked for the Federal guidance my bill offers. In recent cases, OPM was confused by protests after citing an ANC (Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner) for violations of the Hatch Act when he ran for higher office, even though ANCs are "elected officials" under D.C. law and therefore should be permitted to run for higher office. As a result of the failure to clear up the confusion, the application of the Hatch Act to ANCs has been selectively enforced by OPM. For example, although OPM has filed cases charging Hatch Act violations against an ANC running for the D.C. Council, it more often has not filed when several members of the current D.C. City Council ran for the D.C. Council from positions as ANCs. These examples show the difficulty created because Congress has failed to conform D.C.'s local jurisdiction created by the Home Rule Act of 1974 with the OPM's Federal jurisdiction over Federal Hatch Act matters today.

This is an uncomplicated and straightforward bill. It is not controversial, and it has been enacted by the House before. I ask that the House approve H.R. 1345.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this much-needed measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1345.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHNNY GRANT HOLLYWOOD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2760) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1615 North Wilcox Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the "Johnny Grant Hollywood Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2760

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JOHNNY GRANT HOLLYWOOD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1615 North Wilcox Avenue in Los Angeles, California, shall be known and designated as the “Johnny Grant Hollywood Post Office Building”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Johnny Grant Hollywood Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2760, a bill which I introduced to designate a post office in my district as the “Johnny Grant Hollywood Post Office Building”.

Johnny Grant and Hollywood are synonymous. As Tinseltown’s honorary mayor, he was one of the community’s most enthusiastic supporters for more than 50 years. He served as chairman of the Walk of Fame Selection Committee and the Hollywood Historic Trust. He not only created what was to become part of Hollywood’s history but had been a longtime supporter for preserving Cinema City’s past.

Johnny Grant was also a big supporter of public diplomacy. Over the Memorial Day recess period, I took 30 films donated by Johnny Grant before he passed away to South Africa and donated them to the Rosa Parks Library and Information Center at the U.S. Embassy. The films will be accessible to the public and will be used to promote the United States’ moral values, principles, and culture.

Grant was a retired major general in the California State Military Reserve. He was sought out to advise the Guard in his areas of expertise: morale, public affairs, recruiting, and special events. Though retired, he continued to be recalled by California’s Adjutant General for special duties.

In 1982, the State of California showed their appreciation for Johnny Grant’s 30 years of service by awarding him the Order of California, the State’s highest honor. Governor George Deukmejian, in an unprecedented act, awarded Johnny Grant a second Order of California at the State Capitol in 1990. General Grant was also the recipient of the National Guard’s Medal of Merit.

In June of 1999, retired Major General Johnny Grant was recalled to temporary active duty to promote and produce events saluting the California National Guard on its 150th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill to honor Johnny Grant for a lifetime of public service.

And I just want you to know, before his sudden death, he had completed 60 trips to entertain our troops, more than any other celebrity who has gone overseas and around the country, so we honor him also for that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join with the gentlelady in supporting her legislation. Every member of the California delegation, in fact, has supported this. Because it’s in Representative WATSON’s district, of course, it’s her bill, but Johnny Grant was bigger than Hollywood, bigger than California.

During his decades of service outside of Hollywood, Johnny Grant represented the finest in American service. After his service in the Army Air Corps during World War II, he continued supporting in many ways our men and women in uniform for the rest of his life.

In 1952, when Mr. Grant, along with Bing Crosby, Bob Hope, and Frank Sinatra, hosted the first national telethon, a fundraiser to send American Olympic athletes to the Summer Olympics in Finland, he, in fact, set a path of service in all aspects of public life continuing with the Olympics, adding to that the Boy Scouts, the USO, fire and police services and, of course, his many trips overseas.

In addition to the 60 USO trips that Mr. Grant did, I want to note two of them, because during the very difficult times in 1982 and 1983, he distinguished himself by being willing to go to Beirut to support and entertain our marines there long after many people had considered that to be out of the way. He also made two trips to Saudi Arabia during Desert Shield and Desert Storm. He continued to support the USO along with Bob Hope and his many other friends throughout his life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we’ve given a lot of awards to a lot of people less deserving and who dedicated less their entire lives. Many celebrities are for causes when they’re in their active career. Mr. Grant was for causes that were fully supported by the American people but fully funded by the generosity of people like him with his time and his energy for so many years.

So I join with the gentlelady in supporting H.R. 2760, urge its passage, remind all of us that, in fact, there are those who give far less that have had these honors bestowed on them, and I certainly thank the gentlelady for picking this Hollywood post office to be the “Johnny Grant Hollywood Post Office Building”.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank DARRELL ISSA, my colleague, for his words about Johnny Grant. And I want you to know, Johnny knew he would live forever, and now that we’re

going to have a building named after him in the new remodeled and revitalized Hollywood, he, indeed, his image, will live forever. So I thank my colleague.

And in closing, I again urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Johnny Grant through the passage of H.R. 2760.

Ms. WATSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2760.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o’clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

GENERAL LEAVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, general leave to revise and extend is granted on the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2760.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL URBAN AIR TOXICS RESEARCH CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the Board of Directors of the National Urban Air Toxics Research Center:

Mrs. Herminia Palacio, M.D., M.P.H., Bellaire, Texas

Mr. John Walke, Washington, D.C.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER, THE HONORABLE GEORGE RADANOVICH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Donna J. Dami, Special Projects, the Honorable GEORGE RADANOVICH, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 17, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DONNA J. DAMI,
Special Projects.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 324, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 310, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3123, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 324, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 324.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 145, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 687]

YEAS—249

Abercrombie	Carson (IN)	Doggett
Ackerman	Castor (FL)	Donnelly (IN)
Adler (NJ)	Chandler	Doyle
Altmire	Childers	Driehaus
Andrews	Chu	Edwards (MD)
Arcuri	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Baca	Cleaver	Ehlers
Baird	Clyburn	Ellison
Baldwin	Cohen	Ellsworth
Barrow	Connolly (VA)	Engel
Bean	Conyers	Eshoo
Becerra	Cooper	Etheridge
Berman	Costa	Farr
Berry	Costello	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Fortenberry
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Foster
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Frank (MA)
Bocieri	Cummings	Frelinghuysen
Boren	Dahlkemper	Fudge
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Giffords
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Davis (TN)	Gordon (TN)
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Grayson
Bright	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Cao	Diaz-Balart, L.	Griffith
Capps	Diaz-Balart, M.	Grijalva
Cardoza	Dicks	Hall (NY)
Carnahan	Dingell	Halvorson

Hare	Massa	Roybal-Allard
Harman	Matheson	Ruppersberger
Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Salazar
Heinrich	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda
Herseht Sandlin	McDermott	T.
Higgins	McGovern	Sarbanes
Hill	McHugh	Schakowsky
Himes	McIntyre	Schauer
Hinchee	McMahon	Schiff
Hinojosa	McNerney	Schrader
Hirono	Meek (FL)	Schwartz
Hodes	Meeks (NY)	Scott (GA)
Holden	Melancon	Scott (VA)
Holt	Michaud	Serrano
Honda	Miller (NC)	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sherman
Inslee	Minnick	Shuler
Israel	Mitchell	Sires
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Skelton
Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)	Slaughter
(TX)	Moore (WI)	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (CT)	Snyder
Jones	Murphy (NY)	Space
Kagen	Murphy, Patrick	Speier
Kanjorski	Murphy, Tim	Spratt
Kaptur	Nadler (NY)	Stark
Kennedy	Napolitano	Stupak
Kildee	Neal (MA)	Sutton
Kilroy	Nye	Teague
Kind	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Kissell	Olver	Tierney
Klein (FL)	Ortiz	Titus
Kosmas	Pallone	Tonko
Kratovil	Pascrell	Towns
Kucinich	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas
Lance	Payne	Van Hollen
Langevin	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Perriello	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Peters	Walz
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Wasserman
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Lewis (GA)	Platts	Waters
Lipinski	Pomeroy	Watson
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Watt
Loeb sack	Quigley	Waxman
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Weiner
Lowe y	Rangel	Welch
Lujan	Reichert	Wexler
Lynch	Reyes	Whitfield
Maffei	Richardson	Wilson (OH)
Maloney	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey
Markey (CO)	Ross	Wu
Marshall	Rothman (NJ)	Yarmuth

NAYS—145

Aderholt	Duncan	Lungren, Daniel
Akin	Emerson	E.
Alexander	Fallin	Mack
Austria	Flake	Manzullo
Bachmann	Fleming	Marchant
Bachus	Forbes	McCarthy (CA)
Bartlett	Fox	McCauley
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Biggart	Garrett (NJ)	McCotter
Bilbray	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Bilirakis	Gohmert	McKeon
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McMorris
Blunt	Granger	Rodgers
Boehner	Graves	Mica
Bonner	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Bono Mack	Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)
Boozman	Harper	Miller, Gary
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Broun (GA)	Heller	Myrick
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Nunes
Ginny	Hoekstra	Olson
Buchanan	Hunter	Paul
Burgess	Inglis	Paulsen
Burton (IN)	Issa	Pence
Buyer	Jenkins	Petri
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Cantor	Jordan (OH)	Posey
Capito	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Carter	King (NY)	Putnam
Cassidy	Kingston	Radanovich
Davile	Kline (MN)	Rehberg
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Roe (TN)
Coble	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Coffman (CO)	Lee (NY)	Rooney
Cole	Lewis (CA)	Roskam
Conaway	Linder	Royce
Crenshaw	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Schmidt
Dent		Schock

NOT VOTING—39

Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Rodriguez
Berkley	Filner	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Gallegly	Rogers (MI)
Boyd	Gerlach	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Gutierrez	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ryan (OH)
Campbell	Kirk	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Latham	Sestak
Carney	LaTourette	Shimkus
Clarke	Markey (MA)	Simpson
Davis (AL)	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Deal (GA)	Murtha	Taylor
Delahunt	Polis (CO)	Young (AK)

□ 1902

Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. CRENSHAW, TERRY, SCHOCK and HALL of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam speaker, on rollcall 687, I was unable to vote, as I was away from the Capitol in my capacity as Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEM- BRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

HALE SCOUTS ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 310, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 310.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, answered “present” 7, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 688]

YEAS—388

Abercrombie Diaz-Balart, L. Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Ackerman Diaz-Balart, M. Kissell
Aderholt Dicks Klein (FL)
Adler (NJ) Dingell Kline (MN)
Akin Doggett Kosmas
Alexander Donnelly (IN) Kratovil
Altmire Doyle Lamborn
Andrews Driehaus Lance
Arcuri Duncan Langevin
Austria Edwards (MD) Larsen (WA)
Baca Edwards (TX) Larson (CT)
Bachmann Ehlers Latta
Bachus Ellison Lee (CA)
Baird Ellsworth Lee (NY)
Barrow Emerson Levin
Bartlett Engel Lewis (CA)
Barton (TX) Eshoo Lewis (GA)
Bean Etheridge Linder
Becerra Fallin Lipinski
Berman Farr LoBiondo
Berry Fattah Loeb sack
Biggett Flake Lofgren, Zoe
Bilbray Fleming Lowey
Bilirakis Forbes Lucas
Bishop (GA) Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
Bishop (NY) Foster Luján
Bishop (UT) Foss Lummis
Blackburn Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
Blumenauer Frelinghuysen E.
Blunt Fudge Lynch
Bocieri Garrett (NJ) Mack
Boehner Giffords Maffei
Bonner Gingrey (GA) Maloney
Bono Mack Gohmert
Boozman Gonzalez Marchant
Boren Goodlatte Markey (CO)
Boswell Gordon (TN) Marshall
Boucher Granger Massa
Boustany Graves Matheson
Brady (PA) Grayson Matsui
Braley (IA) Green, Al McCarthy (CA)
Bright Green, Gene McCaul
Broun (GA) Griffith McClintock
Brown (SC) Grijalva McCollum
Brown-Waite, Ginny Guthrie McCotter
Buchanan Hall (NY) McDermott
Burgess Hall (TX) McGovern
Burton (IN) Halvorson McHenry
Butterfield Hare McHugh
Buyer Harman McIntyre
Calvert Harper McKeon
Camp Hastings (FL) McMahon
Camp Hastings (WA) McMorris
Cantor Heinrich Rodgers
Cao Heller McNeerney
Capito Hensarling Meek (FL)
Capps Herger Meeks (NY)
Cardoza Herseth Sandlin Melancon
Carnahan Higgins Mica
Carson (IN) Hill Michaud
Carter Himes Miller (FL)
Cassidy Hinchey Miller (MI)
Castle Miller (NC) Miller (NC)
Castor (FL) Hirono Miller, Gary
Chaffetz Hodes Mitchell
Chandler Hoekstra Mollohan
Childers Holden Moore (KS)
Chu Holt Moore (WI)
Clay Honda Moran (KS)
Cleaver Hoyer Moran (VA)
Clyburn Hunter Murphy (CT)
Coble Inglis Murphy (NY)
Coffman (CO) Inslee Murphy, Patrick
Cohen Israel Murphy, Tim
Cole Issa Myrick
Conaway Jackson (IL) Nadler (NY)
Connolly (VA) Jackson-Lee Napolitano
Conyers (TX) Neale (MA)
Cooper Jenkins Neugebauer
Costa Johnson (GA) Nunes
Costello Johnson (IL) Nye
Courtney Johnson, E. B. Oberstar
Crenshaw Johnson, Sam Obey
Crowley Jones Olson
Cuellar Jordan (OH) Oliver
Culberson Kagen Ortiz
Cummings Kanjorski Pallone
Dahlkemper Kaptur Pascarell
Davis (CA) Kennedy Pastor (AZ)
Davis (IL) Kildee Paul
Davis (KY) Kilpatrick (MI) Paulsen
Davis (TN) Kilroy Payne
DeFazio Kind Pence
DeGette King (IA) Perlmutter
DeLauro King (NY) Perriello
Dent Kingston Peters

Peterson Schakowsky Thompson (PA)
Petri Schauer Thornberry
Pingree (ME) Schiff Tiahrt
Pitts Schmidt Tiberi
Platts Schock Tierney
Pomeroy Schrader Titus
Posey Schwartz Towns
Price (GA) Scott (VA) Tsongas
Price (NC) Sensenbrenner Turner
Putnam Serrano Upton
Quigley Sessions Van Hollen
Radanovich Shadegg Velázquez
Rahall Shea-Porter Visclosky
Rangel Sherman Walden
Rehberg Shuler Walz
Reichert Shuster Wamp
Reyes Sires Wasserman
Richardson Skelton Schultz
Roe (TN) Smith (NE) Waters
Rogers (AL) Smith (NJ) Watson
Rooney Smith (TX) Watt
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (WA) Weiner
Roskam Snyder Welch
Ross Souder Westmoreland
Rothman (NJ) Space Wexler
Roybal-Allard Speier Whitfield
Royce Spratt Wilson (OH)
Ruppersberger Stearns Wilson (SC)
Ryan (OH) Stupak Wittman
Ryan (WI) Sullivan Wolf
Salazar Sutton Teague
Sánchez, Linda T. Terry
T. Thompson (CA) Yarmuth
Sarbanes Thompson (MS) Young (FL)
Scalise

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—7

Baldwin Miller, George Woolsey
Frank (MA) Stark
Kucinich Waxman

NOT VOTING—38

Barrett (SC) Filner Rogers (KY)
Berkley Gallegly Rogers (MI)
Boyd Gerlach Rohrabacher
Brady (TX) Gutierrez Rush
Brown, Corrine Kirk Sanchez, Loretta
Campbell Latham Sestak
Capuano LaTourette Shimkus
Carney Markey (MA) Simpson
Clarke McCarthy (NY) Slaughter
Davis (AL) Minnick Tanner
Deal (GA) Murtha Taylor
Delahunt Polis (CO) Young (AK)
Dreier Rodriguez

□ 1914

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California and KUCINICH changed their vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 688, I was unable to vote, as I was away from the Capitol in my capacity as Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL REMEDIATION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3123, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3123, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 191, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 689]

YEAS—206

Aderholt Granger Mitchell
Akin Graves Moran (KS)
Alexander Griffith Murphy (NY)
Altmire Guthrie Murphy, Tim
Arcuri Hall (NY) Myrick
Austria Hall (TX) Neugebauer
Bachmann Harper Nunes
Bachus Hastings (WA) Nye
Baird Heinrich Oberstar
Bean Heller Olson
Biggett Hensarling Paulsen
Bilbray Herger Pence
Bilirakis Herseth Sandlin Perlmutter
Bishop (UT) Higgins Perriello
Blackburn Hill Pitts
Blunt Hoekstra Platts
Bocieri Hunter Poe (TX)
Boehner Inglis Posey
Bonner Issa Price (GA)
Bono Mack Jenkins Putnam
Boozman Johnson (IL) Radanovich
Boren Johnson, Sam Rehberg
Boucher Jones Reichert
Boustany Jordan (OH) Richardson
Bright Kaptur Roe (TN)
Brown (SC) Kilroy Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite, Kind Rooney
Ginny King (IA) Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan King (NY) Roskam
Burgess Kingstons Ross
Burton (IN) Kirkpatrick (AZ) Royce
Buyer Kline (MN) Ruppersberger
Calvert Kratovil Ryan (WI)
Camp Lamborn Salazar
Cantor Lance Scalise
Cao LaTourette Schmidt
Capito Latta Schock
Carnahan Lee (NY) Sensenbrenner
Carter Lewis (CA) Sessions
Cassidy Linder Shadegg
Castle Lipinski Shuster
Chaffetz LoBiondo Smith (NE)
Childers Lucas Smith (NJ)
Coffman (CO) Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)
Cole Lummis Snyder
Conaway Lungren, Daniel Souder
Crenshaw E. Space
Culberson Mack Spratt
Dahlkemper Manzullo Stearns
Davis (KY) Marchant Sullivan
Dent Marshall Teague
Diaz-Balart, L. McCarthy (CA) Terry
Diaz-Balart, M. McCaul Thompson (PA)
Dicks McClintock Thornberry
Donnelly (IN) McCotter Tiahrt
Ehlers McHenry Tiberi
Emerson McHugh Titus
Fallin McIntyre Towns
Fattah McKeon Turner
Fleming McMorris Upton
Forbes Rodgers Visclosky
Fortenberry McNeerney Walden
Foster Melancon Wamp
Foss Mica Westmoreland
Franks (AZ) Michaud Whitfield
Frelinghuysen Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ) Miller (MI) Wittman
Gingrey (GA) Miller (NC) Wolf
Gohmert Miller, Gary Young (FL)
Goodlatte Minnick

NAYS—191

Abercrombie Cummings
Ackerman Davis (CA)
Adler (NJ) Davis (IL)
Andrews Carson (IN)
Baca Castor (FL)
Baird Chandler DeFazio
Baldwin Chu DeGette
Barrow Clay DeLauro
Bartlett Cleaver Dingell
Becerra Clyburn Doggett
Coble Coyle Doyle
Cohen Cohen Driehaus
Connolly (VA) Connolly (VA) Duncan
Conyers Edwards (MD)
Cooper Edwards (TX)
Costa Ellison
Costello Ellsworth
Courtney Courtney Engel
Crowley Eshoo
Cuellar Etheridge

Farr	Loeb	Loeb
Flake	Lofgren, Zoe	Loeb
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Loeb
Fudge	Lujan	Loeb
Giffords	Lynch	Loeb
Gonzalez	Maffei	Loeb
Gordon (TN)	Maloney	Loeb
Grayson	Markey (CO)	Loeb
Green, Al	Massa	Loeb
Green, Gene	Matheson	Loeb
Grijalva	Matsui	Loeb
Halvorson	McCollum	Loeb
Hare	McDermott	Loeb
Harman	McGovern	Loeb
Hastings (FL)	McMahon	Loeb
Himes	Meek (FL)	Loeb
Hinche	Meeks (NY)	Loeb
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Loeb
Hirono	Mollohan	Loeb
Hodes	Moore (KS)	Loeb
Holden	Moore (WI)	Loeb
Holt	Moran (VA)	Loeb
Honda	Murphy (CT)	Loeb
Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick	Loeb
Inslee	Nadler (NY)	Loeb
Israel	Napolitano	Loeb
Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Loeb
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Loeb
(TX)	Olver	Loeb
Johnson (GA)	Ortiz	Loeb
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Loeb
Kagen	Pascarella	Loeb
Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)	Loeb
Kennedy	Paul	Loeb
Kildee	Payne	Loeb
Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters	Loeb
Kissell	Peterson	Loeb
Klein (FL)	Petri	Loeb
Kosmas	Pingree (ME)	Loeb
Kucinich	Pomeroy	Loeb
Langevin	Price (NC)	Loeb
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Loeb
Larson (CT)	Rahall	Loeb
Lee (CA)	Rangel	Loeb
Levin	Reyes	Loeb
Lewis (GA)	Rothman (NJ)	Loeb

NOT VOTING—36

Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Rodriguez
Berkley	Dreier	Rogers (KY)
Berman	Filner	Rogers (MI)
Boyd	Gallegly	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Sanchez, Loretta
Campbell	Kirk	Sestak
Capuano	Latham	Shimkus
Carney	Markey (MA)	Simpson
Clarke	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Murtha	Taylor
Deal (GA)	Polis (CO)	Young (AK)

□ 1922

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana and LANGEVIN and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois and CRENSHAW changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 689, I was unable to vote as I was away from the Capitol in my capacity as Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, today, I experienced unavoidable travel delays while returning to Washington from my congressional district and regretfully missed three rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on all three bills: H.R. 324—Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act; H.R. 310—HALE Scouts Act; H.R. 3123—Leadville Mine Drainage Tunnel Remediation Act of 2009.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 687, 688 and 689.

RYAN WHITE REAUTHORIZATION

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, welcome back. I rise today to urge my colleagues to act swiftly to reauthorize the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Act before it sunsets at the end of this month.

Nineteen years ago, Ryan White, a young man who contracted HIV from a routine blood transfusion for his hemophilia, died from AIDS. Out of Ryan's death came life in the form of the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act, which now provides care to 500,000 victims of AIDS and their families each year. The Ryan White Act is considered the “payer of last resort,” providing assistance to those who would otherwise go without care.

Reauthorizing the Ryan White Treatment Modernization Act is imperative, and so is passing health care reform. While Ryan White is gone, we owe it to work together to swiftly pass the Ryan White Act and health care reform.

HISTORIC TURNOUTS FOR TOWNHALLS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, during August, people all across America stood up to have their voices heard on the issue of health care.

In South Carolina, I was grateful to host four townhalls with the largest turnout in the history of our State. We had 1,700 people at Keenan High School in Columbia, 1,500 people at Lexington High School, 1,500 people at Beaufort High School, and 1,200 people at Hilton Head High School. The discussions were lively, but respectful, with over 95 percent of constituents opposed to the government takeover of the health care system. They want to see health insurance reform.

Every quarter during my 25-year service in the State Senate and Congress I have hosted townhalls, but this August the turnout was absolutely historic. It is important to share with the American people that there is another choice for reform. Republicans offered positive reforms, including the Empowering Patients First Act, H.R. 3400. This will fix what is failing in our health care system while protecting the doctor-patient relationship. We want to expand affordability and accessibility without adding billions to our Nation's debt and eliminating 1.6 million jobs, as cited by the NFIB.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. This Friday, we remember the Americans whose lives were taken 8 years ago as well as those sickened by the ensuing rescue and recovery efforts.

In the wake of that horrific crime, America's first responders did not back down or turn away. However, we as a Nation have not honored them with the same care and commitment and have yet to repay their sacrifices.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues and the entire Nation the services of firefighter and 9/11 first responder, John McNamara. A 10-year veteran of the New York Fire Department, John was a first responder who assisted the rescue efforts following September 11 and answered the call again for the citizens of Louisiana during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

For years John fought for the passage of legislation to help his fellow sick first responders even as he himself was dying from colon cancer, which he was diagnosed with in 2006. John was 44 when he passed away earlier this year, leaving behind his wife, Jennifer, and 2-year-old son, Jack.

Like John McNamara, many of the brave first responders who served at Ground Zero are struggling with debilitating diseases as a result of their courageous efforts. Too many people have moved on from 9/11, but the first responders and their families whose health is suffering cannot move on, and neither should we until we have kept our promise. We must pass the 9/11 Health and Compensation Act this year and take care of these heroes.

In the words of one of John McNamara's fellow first responders, “Until his last day, John made us promise that we would carry on what he started. John's work is not done, and neither is ours.”

HONORING OFFICER CRITTENDEN

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Minnesotan who lost his life in the line of duty yesterday, Officer Richard Crittenden.

A 9-year veteran of the North St. Paul Police Department, Officer Crittenden dedicated his life to protecting others. Part of his life of service included being a 4-year deputy with the Wabasha County Sheriff's Department, and before that an enforcement officer for the Hennepin County Parks Department. And if that wasn't enough, he also served our Nation as a member of the U.S. Army. Unfortunately, when Officer Crittenden responded to a domestic disturbance call, things went tragically awry and we lost one of Minnesota's finest.

This husband, father and grandfather chose a life of service, protecting and defending his friends, neighbors, and the public. His life and work demonstrate a public service of the highest caliber. With this loss, I offer my prayers and deepest sympathies to the family and friends of Officer Crittenden, and I urge all Americans to take the time to thank those who put their lives in danger every day in order to protect us.

□ 1930

ADDRESSING HEALTH CARE AND ECONOMIC ISSUES

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the 85 Members of the House who signed onto H.R. 676, the bill which JOHN CONYERS and I authored, which establishes Medicare for all. It's very clear that there is only one way that you can control costs and can make it possible for people to have the doctor of choice. That legislation, H.R. 676, accomplishes that.

I would like to suggest that the underlying angst that we have seen reflected across this country in the last couple of months at townhall meetings and in individual confrontations is not simply about health care, and we ignore at our peril the underlying economic issues that are confronting this country. The fact that there are 15 million Americans out of work, the fact that so many people have lost their investments, that so many people have lost their pensions is what is moving the American people to revolt against their own government.

So we need to look at this in a broader way, not only to address the health care issue but also to address the underlying economic questions.

QUIT TALKING—START LISTENING

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, the President of the United States was addressing a group yesterday, and he came after, once again, the critics of his health care proposal. We got the health care bill that was filed in the House, and that's what we've been working from. He has said that, if you like your policy, you can keep it. Obviously, he hasn't read the policy. I would recommend he read page 16, and he'll find out that what he's saying is not true.

He went on and is quoted in talking about his critics as saying, "You've heard all the lies. I've got a question for all those folks: What are you going to do? What's your answer? What's your solution? And you know what? They don't have one."

Madam Speaker, I would like to encourage the President to quit talking

so much and listen. There are lots of proposals out there. Read Human Events today. You'll see there are plenty of proposals. Quit talking. Start listening.

HEALTH CARE REFORM WITH A PUBLIC OPTION

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is a delight to be back with my colleagues, but more importantly, it was enriching to be with my constituents at some 10 townhall meetings and at any number of personal appearances before organizations to talk about changing America's health care system for the better of all Americans. After 60 years, we now have an opportunity to address the question of the uninsured and to make sure that those who have insurance can keep it.

I have read page 16. What it says is that your private insurance is grandfathered in and that, if your insurance in 5 years does not meet basic standards, we'll require your insurers to do so. There is nothing on page 16 that says anything about eliminating your insurance, but it does reform the insurance industry of America—no pre-existing disease; preventative care. We can pay for it. The Congressional Budget Office said so.

So today, Madam Speaker, I am here gladly to stand with the President and to join him in the question: What will you do? It's time to move on health care reform with a vigorous public option.

RESPECTING THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. CAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, the Office of the President of the United States is higher than the individual who occupies the seat. It is a symbol of freedom, respect and of the enduring values of our Republic.

Like every American, the President has the right to speak freely. In fact, it is his duty to address the American people. So, as I watched the events this past weekend, which suggested that his words would be subversive, controversial or otherwise inappropriate, I was very disappointed. Every American President has had the opportunity to speak to schoolchildren. President Obama is no exception.

The President's address to students this morning promoted students setting high standards, supporting our teachers and principals and reforming our schools. He encouraged students to take advantage of educational opportunities for successful careers and the opportunities to achieve the American Dream.

I ask that we, as Americans, learn to make the distinction between our disagreements with the man in the Oval Office and our history of respecting the office, itself.

THE PRESIDENT FOR ALL AMERICANS AND HEALTH COVERAGE FOR ALL

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague who just spoke before me because I think he hit the nail right on the head.

President Obama spoke to schoolchildren today. I listened to it. It was very moving. It was very good to see the President of the United States talk directly to America's youth, and it was disgraceful to see, during the past week, parents, some teachers and some schools saying that they weren't going to allow their children to listen to the President of the United States. What a sad day it is when people can talk that way.

The President of the United States is to be respected by all. He is all of our President, not just the President for the people who voted for him. I voted for him, and I'm proud that I did, but he is everybody's President; he is every Americans' President.

I believe that tomorrow, as he did today with schoolchildren, the President will make a very, very good speech on health care—highlighting health care, why we need health care reform, why it's important to have it. There are 40 million Americans who have no health insurance coverage whatsoever—47 million—and it will soon be 60 and 70 million. That's why we need health coverage, and I welcome the President's speech tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE LIFE OF SVEND AUKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise to mark the death of a good friend and of a good friend of America—Svend Aukén—who died last month after a long struggle with cancer.

Svend was the first Vice President of the Danish Parliament, the Folketing, and he was a political legend in his country. I had the opportunity to meet and work closely with Svend on many occasions, most recently when he was one of my gracious hosts on a trip to Denmark this May.

Each time, I was impressed by the vitality, the sense of humor and the idealism of this man who devoted his life to public service from the day he entered politics at the age of 28, right up to his death a few weeks ago. Svend was a kind, wise and insightful friend, and I will miss him.

Today, I rise to offer my condolences to his wife, Anne, to his children and to other friends and family whom he left behind. I also, of course, rise to pay him tribute.

Svend's country is home to a proud political tradition. It stretches from the solidarity Danes showed when they protected their Jewish fellow citizens from the onslaught of the Holocaust to the foresight Denmark proved by becoming entirely energy independent.

Svend Auken was a real humanitarian and a visionary political thinker who was worthy of his proud heritage. As leader of the Social Democrats and as a long-serving minister for the environment and energy, Svend left a powerful mark on his country and on Europe, and he became an inspiration to leaders around the world who are struggling to confront common threats such as global warming.

As a leading Danish paper wrote, "The country's landscape, specked with the thousands of windmills that have become a symbol of Denmark, can be traced back to Auken's efforts." Svend deserves credit for his country's secure retirement system as well.

Svend's friendship wasn't just meaningful to me on a personal level; the relationships and respect he cultivated on both sides of our political aisle helped to cement the powerful friendship between America and its key NATO ally, Denmark.

As a Danish-American myself and as a Member of Congress, I have been proud to support and nurture this key alliance. I chair the Congressional Friends of Denmark Caucus, along with my friend HOWARD COBLE, and I meet frequently with visiting Danish leaders, whose inquisitive and analytical approach in meetings is always very notable.

Though Svend is gone, I know that the progress he made for his country and the friendship he helped sustain with ours will be among his lasting legacies. I also know that he lived a full, committed and creative life.

As Svend said when he announced his decision to continue serving despite his cancer, "The amount of time you have left to live, be it short or long, is life, itself, and you shouldn't squander it." Svend did not squander his life. I believe that Svend died secure in the knowledge that he made everything he could of the time he was given, and there is no better end than that.

I pay respect to a friend, a colleague, a great Danish leader, a great European leader, a great international citizen—Svend Auken.

U.S. PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, on June 25, 2009, I joined Congressman JIM MCGOVERN in offering an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment would have required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress which outlines an exit strategy for our Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

During the floor debate that day, I, along with other Members, talked about the history of Afghanistan and about the difficulties that other nations have had there—from Alexander the Great to England and Russia. As just one measure of the hazardous conditions facing our troops in Afghanistan, 99 American servicemembers have been killed in Afghanistan since June 25, 2009—the day we debated the amendment.

While I regret that the amendment was not approved, I still believe it is critical for the current administration to clearly articulate benchmarks for success and an end point to its war strategy in Afghanistan.

Last week, on September 1, 2009, conservative columnist George Will wrote an op-ed, titled "Time to Get Out of Afghanistan." In it, he shares his insights on our Nation's current strategy in Afghanistan.

I submit the full text of this op-ed for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 1, 2009]

TIME TO GET OUT OF AFGHANISTAN

(By George F. Will)

"Yesterday," reads the e-mail from Allen, a Marine in Afghanistan, "I gave blood because a Marine, while out on patrol, stepped on a [mine's] pressure plate and lost both legs." Then "another Marine with a bullet wound to the head was brought in. Both Marines died this morning."

"I'm sorry about the drama," writes Allen, an enthusiastic infantryman willing to die "so that each of you may grow old." He says: "I put everything in God's hands." And: "Semper Paratus!"

Allen and others of America's finest are also in Washington's hands. This city should keep faith with them by rapidly reversing the trajectory of America's involvement in Afghanistan, where, says the Dutch commander of coalition forces in a southern province, walking through the region is "like walking through the Old Testament."

U.S. strategy—protecting the population—is increasingly troop-intensive while Americans are increasingly impatient about "deteriorating" (says Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) conditions. The war already is nearly 50 percent longer than the combined U.S. involvements in two world wars, and NATO assistance is reluctant and often risible.

The U.S. strategy is "clear, hold and build." Clear? Taliban forces can evaporate and then return, confident that U.S. forces will forever be too few to hold gains. Hence nation-building would be impossible even if we knew how, and even if Afghanistan were not the second-worst place to try: The Brookings Institution ranks Somalia as the only nation with a weaker state.

Military historian Max Hastings says Kabul controls only about a third of the country—"control" is an elastic concept—and "our" Afghans may prove no more via-

ble than were 'our' Vietnamese, the Saigon regime." Just 4,000 Marines are contesting control of Helmand province, which is the size of West Virginia. The New York Times reports a Helmand official saying he has only "police officers who steal and a small group of Afghan soldiers who say they are here for 'vacation.'" Afghanistan's \$23 billion gross domestic product is the size of Boise's. Counterinsurgency doctrine teaches, not very helpfully, that development depends on security, and that security depends on development. Three-quarters of Afghanistan's poppy production for opium comes from Helmand. In what should be called Operation Sisypheus, U.S. officials are urging farmers to grow other crops. Endive, perhaps?

Even though violence exploded across Iraq after, and partly because of, three elections, Afghanistan's recent elections were called "crucial." To what? They came, they went, they altered no fundamentals, all of which militate against American "success," whatever that might mean. Creation of an effective central government? Afghanistan has never had one. U.S. Ambassador Karl Eikenberry hopes for a "renewal of trust" of the Afghan people in the government, but the Economist describes President Hamid Karzai's government—his vice presidential running mate is a drug trafficker—as so "inept, corrupt and predatory" that people sometimes yearn for restoration of the warlords, "who were less venal and less brutal than Mr. Karzai's lot."

Mullen speaks of combating Afghanistan's "culture of poverty." But that took decades in just a few square miles of the South Bronx. Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the U.S. commander in Afghanistan, thinks jobs programs and local government services might entice many "accidental guerrillas" to leave the Taliban. But before launching New Deal 2.0 in Afghanistan, the Obama administration should ask itself: If U.S. forces are there to prevent reestablishment of al-Qaeda bases—evidently there are none now—must there be nation-building invasions of Somalia, Yemen and other sovereignty vacuums?

U.S. forces are being increased by 21,000, to 68,000, bringing the coalition total to 110,000. About 9,000 are from Britain, where support for the war is waning. Counterinsurgency theory concerning the time and the ratio of forces required to protect the population indicates that, nationwide, Afghanistan would need hundreds of thousands of coalition troops, perhaps for a decade or more. That is inconceivable.

So, instead, forces should be substantially reduced to serve a comprehensively revised policy: America should do only what can be done from offshore, using intelligence, drones, cruise missiles, airstrikes and small, potent Special Forces units, concentrating on the porous 1,500-mile border with Pakistan, a nation that actually matters.

Genius, said de Gaulle, recalling Bismarck's decision to halt German forces short of Paris in 1870, sometimes consists of knowing when to stop. Genius is not required to recognize that in Afghanistan, when means now, before more American valor, such as Allen's, is squandered.

□ 1945

I would like to highlight just a couple of Will's key points. He wrote, "The war already is nearly 50 percent longer than the combined U.S. involvement in two world wars, and NATO assistance is reluctant."

"The U.S. strategy is 'clear, hold and build.' Clear? Taliban forces can evaporate and then return, confident that U.S. forces will forever be too few to

hold gains. Hence nation-building would be impossible even if we knew how, and even if Afghanistan were not the second-worst place to try."

Will further states, "Counterinsurgency theory concerning the time and the ratio of forces required to protect the population indicates that, nationwide, Afghanistan would need hundreds of thousands of coalition troops, perhaps for a decade or more. That is inconceivable."

Madam Speaker, on this same morning this op-ed was published, the retired Marine general Chuck Krulak, the 31st commandant of the Marine Corps, responded by writing an e-mail to Will.

Madam Speaker, I submit the full text of the e-mail for the RECORD.

SEPTEMBER 1, 2009.

Subject: Afghanistan

SIR, I would imagine that your article, "Time to Get Out of Afghanistan" will result in some "incoming" on your Command Post. First and foremost, let me say that I am in total agreement with your assessment. Simply put, no desired end state has ever been clearly articulated and no strategy formulated that would lead us to achieve even an ill defined end state.

A few points:

1. The strategy of "clear, hold and build" would lead one to believe that the US and its Allies are capable of coordinating the elements of national power needed to affect such a strategy. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just getting DOS and DOD on the same page is difficult enough . . . getting NGO's and nation building expertise into the fight is simply a non-starter in a country as dysfunctional as Afghanistan.

2. Your point about troop strength required to "protect" the population and carry out effective counterinsurgency operations is spot on. Instead of a surge of 21,000 troops, McChrystal would need a surge of hundreds of thousands. Not only would our Nation not support such a surge but, MOST distressing, the Military could not support such a surge. Not only are our troops being run ragged but, equally important and totally off most people's radar screens, our equipment is being run ragged. At some point in time, the bill for that equipment will come due and it will be a very large bill.

3. Typical of the 21st Century fight, we are fighting ideas as well as warriors. You can not defeat ideas with bullets . . . you must defeat them with better ideas. For many reasons such as the dysfunction found in the Karzai government, the tribal nature of the country, the abject poverty of the average citizen, the inextricable link to Pakistan, we have been unable to come up with better ideas. We are systematically destroying the poppy fields . . . the country's major source of revenue. At the same time, we are trying to encourage other agricultural efforts. This is one of our "better ideas"??? Sad as it is to say, we would do better to buy the poppy crop ourselves . . . ridding the world of a source of drugs and maintaining the Afghan economy.

4. What in Afghanistan is deemed in our Nation's vital interest? Seriously? Who is the enemy? Seriously? Is the enemy of the United States the Taliban? Is the enemy al Qaeda? We need to determine the answer to those questions immediately. One would think we would have answered them already but none of our actions to date would indicate that we have.

Finally, your recommendation is sound. I would put "hunter-killer teams" along the

borders and in suspected al Qaeda strongholds. I would support them with intelligence, logistics thru the use of parasail's, responsive airpower (need to be close), armed and unarmed (fitted with cameras, infrared, etc) drones, "reach back" capability for cruise missiles, and other capability as needed. The H-K Teams should be given minimal rules of engagement . . . when they identify the bad guys, they need to be empowered to take them out.

Again, don't be dismayed by the people who disagree with you. There are many retired and active duty military who feel you hit the bull's eye.

Semper Fidelis.

CHUCK KRULAK,
General, USMC (Ret),
31st Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In the e-mail General Krulak expressed his "total agreement" with Will's assessment and concluded, "There are many retired and active-duty military who feel you hit the bull's eye."

The general also wrote, "Simply put, no desired end state has ever been as clearly articulated and no strategy formulated that would lead us to achieve even an ill-defined end state. Instead of a surge of 21,000 troops, McChrystal would need a surge of hundreds of thousands. The military could not support such a surge. You cannot defeat ideas with bullets. You must defeat them with better ideas."

Madam Speaker, President Obama is in the midst of reviewing a report by the U.S. commander in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal. It is expected that this review will determine whether or not the President decides to alter the number of U.S. troops to Afghanistan.

The men and women of our military who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan have done a magnificent job. Many have been deployed four and five times. Their desire to serve is greater than ever, but the stress placed on our all-volunteer forces and their families cannot continue forever. That's why it is so important for the current administration to articulate an end point to its war strategy rather than simply ordering another surge of troops.

With that, Madam Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And I close by asking God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

U.S. POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong concern over U.S. policy in Afghanistan. I worry that we are getting sucked deeper and deeper into a war with no end. Our mission continues to grow and grow, with no clear sense of where we are ultimately going. It has been 8 long years.

We have lost too many brave men and women, and we have spent billions and billions of dollars.

The Government of Afghanistan, led by President Hamid Karzai, is incompetent and corrupt. The Afghan president has formed alliances with warlords and drug-lords who have no interest in a better Afghanistan. His military is not reliable and his police are a mess. By all accounts, forces close to Mr. Karzai stuffed ballot boxes in the most recent elections.

Madam Speaker, if this fraud had occurred in virtually every other country in the world, the condemnations from Congress and the administration would be loud and forceful.

After all the sacrifices our troops have made, after all the financial and development assistance, after all the training and military aid, is this the best that we can expect? Don't we deserve better? Don't the Afghan people deserve better?

At a very minimum, we must insist that any aid be contingent on a responsible Afghan government. Without that, then all our investments and good intentions could achieve very little that is sustainable.

The United States has an incredible and magnificent team assembled in Afghanistan. I had the pleasure of meeting many of them during a brief visit to the country over the recess. Both the military and State Department personnel are impressive. I only wish they were in place 8 years ago.

But even a brilliant team can't make up for the inadequacies of the current Afghan government. Our troops are exceptional. I had the privilege of eating dinner with many of them from Massachusetts. I am in awe of their courage and commitment and their patriotism. We owe them a policy that is worthy of their sacrifice. Everyone, Madam Speaker, from the President on down, agrees that a political solution is the only path for a successful, stable Afghanistan.

During consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill a few months ago, I, along with my colleague, Walter Jones, offered an amendment that would have simply required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress by the end of the year what our exit strategy for Afghanistan was. We are not asking for a date certain, we are not advocating an immediate withdrawal, but we wanted an answer to this fundamental question: At what point has our military contribution to the political solution in Afghanistan come to an end so that we can bring our troops home?

I don't believe that the United States should enter into a war without a clearly defined mission, and that means a mission with a beginning, a middle, a transition period and an end. Without that definition and clarity, we will continue to drift from year to year, from administration to administration. Madam Speaker, we need an exit strategy for Afghanistan.

I believe that sending thousands more American troops into Afghanistan, as some in the administration appear to be urging, is a mistake. An escalation of U.S. military forces would further create the impression of an occupation and, in turn, provide a powerful rallying point for those we are trying to defeat.

In last Sunday's New York Times, Nicholas Kristoff cites a statement by many former U.S. intelligence officials warning that the more troops we put in, the greater the opposition.

Madam Speaker, I am not suggesting that we walk away from Afghanistan. We, along with the international community, should help with development aid, investments in education, school feeding, training of their police and military and help with strengthening their civilian institutions.

I also understand the threat from al Qaeda. I still strongly believe that we should hold those responsible for September 11, the attacks of September 11, accountable; and we should be committed to defeating them. I voted for the authorization to use military force after the terrorist attacks.

But, Madam Speaker, al Qaeda is more of a problem in Pakistan than in Afghanistan. And for those who justify our expanded military presence in Afghanistan as a way to prevent al Qaeda from ever coming back and establishing a safe haven, I would ask, are we going to send more troops to Somalia and Sudan and other countries that have provided safe havens for al Qaeda in the past?

Madam Speaker, there are no easy answers in Afghanistan. It is a complicated place, from its people to its geography. I don't pretend to have all the answers.

But I do feel deeply that an escalation of American military forces there would be a mistake and would not solve the many problems and challenges of that country. I fear it would only further complicate matters at a very high cost to our troops and our country.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 2009]
THE AFGHANISTAN ABYSS
(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

President Obama has already dispatched an additional 21,000 American troops to Afghanistan and soon will decide whether to send thousands more. That would be a fateful decision for his presidency, and a group of former intelligence officials and other experts is now reluctantly going public to warn that more troops would be a historic mistake.

The group's concern—dead right, in my view—is that sending more American troops into ethnic Pashtun areas in the Afghan south may only galvanize local people to back the Taliban in repelling the infidels.

"Our policy makers do not understand that the very presence of our forces in the Pashtun areas is the problem," the group said in a statement to me. "The more troops we put in, the greater the opposition. We do not mitigate the opposition by increasing troop levels, but rather we increase the opposition and prove to the Pashtuns that the Taliban are correct.

"The basic ignorance by our leadership is going to cause the deaths of many fine American troops with no positive outcome," the statement said.

The group includes Howard Hart, a former Central Intelligence Agency station chief in Pakistan; David Miller, a former ambassador and National Security Council official; William J. Olson, a counterinsurgency scholar at the National Defense University; and another C.I.A. veteran who does not want his name published but who spent 12 years in the region, was station chief in Kabul at the time the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979, and later headed the C.I.A.'s Counterterrorism Center.

"We share a concern that the country is driving over a cliff," Mr. Miller said.

Mr. Hart, who helped organize the anti-Soviet insurgency in the 1980s, cautions that Americans just don't understand the toughness, determination and fighting skills of the Pashtun tribes. He adds that if the U.S. escalates the war, the result will be radicalization of Pashtuns in Pakistan and further instability there—possibly even the collapse of Pakistan.

These experts are not people who crave publicity; I had to persuade them to go public with their concerns. And their views are widely shared among others who also know Afghanistan well.

"We've bitten off more than we can chew; we're setting ourselves up for failure," said Rory Stewart, a former British diplomat who teaches at Harvard when he is not running a large aid program in Afghanistan. Mr. Stewart describes the American military strategy in Afghanistan as "nonsense."

I'm writing about these concerns because I share them. I'm also troubled because officials in Washington seem to make decisions based on a simplistic caricature of the Taliban that doesn't match what I've found in my reporting trips to Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Among the Pashtuns, the population is not neatly divisible into "Taliban" or "non-Taliban." Rather, the Pashtuns are torn by complex aspirations and fears.

Many Pashtuns I've interviewed are appalled by the Taliban's periodic brutality and think they are too extreme; they think they're a little nuts. But these Pashtuns also admire the Taliban's personal honesty and religious piety, a contrast to the corruption of so many officials around President Hamid Karzai.

Some Taliban are hard-core ideologues, but many join the fight because friends or elders suggest it, because they are avenging the deaths of relatives in previous fighting, because it's a way to earn money, or because they want to expel the infidels from their land—particularly because the foreigners haven't brought the roads, bridges and irrigation projects that had been anticipated.

Frankly, if a bunch of foreign Muslim troops in turbans showed up in my hometown in rural Oregon, searching our homes without bringing any obvious benefit, then we might all take to the hills with our deer rifles as well.

In fairness, the American military has hugely improved its sensitivity, and some commanders in the field have been superb in building trust with Afghans. That works. But all commanders can't be superb, and over all, our increased presence makes Pashtuns more likely to see us as alien occupiers.

That may be why the troop increase this year hasn't calmed things. Instead, 2009 is already the bloodiest year for American troops in Afghanistan—with four months left to go.

The solution is neither to pull out of Afghanistan nor to double down. Rather, we need to continue our presence with a lighter

military footprint, limited to training the Afghan forces and helping them hold major cities, and ensuring that Al Qaeda does not regroup. We must also invest more in education and agriculture development, for that is a way over time to peel Pashtuns away from the Taliban.

This would be a muddled, imperfect strategy with frustratingly modest goals, but it would be sustainable politically and militarily. And it does not require heavy investments of American and Afghan blood.

VAN JONES' RADICAL PAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, one of the important functions of a President is to make sure that the people he puts into important positions have no real background problems that will cause the administration to founder. This administration, this President, has appointed a whole bunch of czars and special assistants to the President, and they really haven't been vetted. They haven't been checked out thoroughly.

One of those is a gentleman who was appointed a special environmental adviser to the President. And, Mr. Jones, who we have all heard about in the last few days, has been found to be an admitted radical communist and leader. Now, that does not reflect well on the administration, and it does not reflect well on the entire Government of the United States because we are not supportive of the communist philosophy.

Now, Mr. Jones said that he was slandered when he resigned, and that was the reason he resigned. So tonight I would like to put some things in the RECORD that show exactly why he should not have been appointed in the first place. And I think it's important that my colleagues understand that these czars and these people that are being appointed really need to be properly vetted. And we certainly don't want people that have a radical agenda being put in positions of leadership.

Jones was a founder and leader of the communist revolutionary organization called Standing Together to Organize a Revolutionary Movement, or STORM. That organization had its roots in a grouping of black people organizing to protest the first Gulf War. STORM was formally founded in 1994, becoming one of the most influential and active radical groups in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The leftist blog Machete 48 identifies STORM's influences as "third-world Marxism (an often vulgar Maoism)."

Speaking to the East Bay Express, Jones said he first became radicalized in the wake of the 1992 Rodney King riots, during which time he was arrested. He said, "I was a rowdy nationalist on April 28, and then the verdicts came down on April 29. By August, I was a communist.

"I met all of these young radical people of color—I mean really radical:

communists and anarchists. And it was, like, 'This is what I need to be a part of.' I spent the next 10 years of my life working with a lot of those people I met in jail, trying to be a revolutionary."

Trevor Loudon, a communist researcher and administrator of the New Zeal Blog, identified several Bay Area communists who worked with STORM, including Elizabeth Martinez, who helped advise Jones' Ella Baker Human Rights Center, which Jones founded to advocate civil justice. Jones and Martinez also attended a "Challenging White Supremacy" workshop together challenging white supremacy.

Martinez was a long-time Maoist who went on to join the Communist Party USA breakaway organization Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, the CCDS, in the early 1990s. According to Loudon, Martinez still serves on the CCDS council and is also a board member of the Movement for a Democratic Society, where she sits alongside former Weathermen radicals Bill Ayers and Bernadine Dorhn.

One of STORM's newsletters featured a tribute to Amilcar Cabral, the late Marxist revolutionary leader of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands. The tribute is noteworthy because Jones reportedly named his son after Cabral and repeatedly concludes every e-mail with a quote from the communist leader.

Jones then, of course, moved on to environmentalism, and that's the position that he took with the administration. But there is no question he is a radical and a member of the Communist Party and has been for a long time and supported their goals and approaches to government.

So I just would like to say, if I were talking to the President tonight, Mr. President, please be careful who you are appointing to these positions of leadership. It's important for the country; it's important for your administration and the image of the United States throughout the world as a beacon of freedom, justice and democracy.

MOST AMERICANS SAY WAR IN AFGHANISTAN IS NOT WORTH FIGHTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern about the recent developments in Afghanistan. Sadly, 51 American troops were killed in August, making it the deadliest month for the United States since the conflict began 8 years ago.

August also was the deadliest month of the war for the combined coalition force. Many innocent civilians were tragically killed in the air strikes during the month of August, and there is growing evidence that the recent elections may have been marred by fraud.

Madam Speaker, for over 8 years we have relied almost exclusively on the

military to stop violent extremism in Afghanistan. But these recent events show that this strategy isn't giving us a victory on the ground or political solutions to the problem. The American people are beginning to recognize that relying on the military option alone isn't the best way to go.

The latest Washington Post-ABC poll shows that 45 percent of the American people want to reduce our forces in Afghanistan, while only 24 percent want to increase our forces. This latest poll from the McClatchy Newspapers came up with similar results.

□ 2000

It is clearly time, Madam Speaker, to develop a new strategy and a new mission for America in Afghanistan. We must begin to use all of the tools of "smart power."

Smart power means improving police and intelligence work in the communities where extremists hide. Well-trained Afghan policemen, who are familiar with local people, with customs and conditions, can often do the best job of hunting down extremists. Smart power also includes regional diplomatic efforts, education, better governance, and a civilian surge of experts and workers to support economic development in Afghanistan. These are the things that will give the Afghan people real hope for their future and eliminate the root causes of violent extremism.

As National Security Advisor James L. Jones has said, This war will not be won by the military alone. We tried that for years. The piece of our strategy that has to work in the next year is economic development. If that is not done right, there are not enough troops in the world to succeed.

I know that President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton agree that improving the lives of the Afghan people is the key to victory. They have pledged to do everything they can to help rebuild Afghanistan and show the Afghan people that we offer them a better future than the Taliban.

Madam Speaker, I and other Members of the House who oppose our occupation of Iraq watched for years as Congress did nothing to prevent that disaster. But we still have time to get it right when it comes to Afghanistan. This time, let's use smart power. It will save lives, save money, and make our country safer.

PRESIDENT SHOULD HOST CONGRESSIONAL TOWNHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Congress will gladly welcome the President tomorrow night to speak to a joint session of Congress about health care. All of us here have been asked hundreds of questions by our constituents over the past month. The Presi-

dent is an innovator in communications. He tries new ideas and is a trendsetter when it comes to new ways to be in touch with the American people.

So as the President addresses Congress on his health care ideas tomorrow night, why doesn't he take some health care questions from Members of Congress, questions that have been asked by the people we represent? After all, we call this the People's House, so why not address questions the American people have?

The questions could be submitted before the President speaks and he can choose the ones he wants to address. This could be a congressional townhall hosted by the President.

Here are just some of the questions I have been asked by the people of Texas.

One: The health care bill seems to cost too much. How are we going to pay for it? This question brought much concern to the people in my district. The Congressional Budget Office says that the pending House bill will cost anywhere from billions to even \$1 trillion to just implement.

Tax increases are in the current plan to pay for this bill, more spending of what we don't have. I made a pledge to my constituents not to vote for a bill that will raise taxes, and I haven't. So how do we pay for this without a forced tax increase on the American people?

Two: Why is this bill so confusing? It is written in a way that even the most reasonable people from even the same political party can honestly disagree on its meaning. The 1,017-page bill, if it passes, will then allow the bureaucrats to determine the meaning of the bill. Also, Texans don't want unelected bureaucrats in this city making their medical decisions on what services they get and don't get. Can we get a clearly written bill that everyone can understand?

Three: Why shouldn't Congress, the czars and members of the Cabinet be required to sign up for the public option? If it is going to be so good for the American people, shouldn't everyone supporting this plan be required to be under the public option, like government officials?

Four: People on Medicare are scared and afraid they are not going to receive any medical treatment. What is in the plan to make sure there is no rationing of medical care for the elderly?

Five: Why not eliminate the hundreds of billions of dollars of fraud and waste in our current Medicare system before we tackle anything else?

Six: All of the amendments offered in committee that would specifically require proof of citizenship to sign up for this new government-run health care were defeated. Americans and legal residents should not be required to pay for the health care of illegals. The bill is confusing on this issue since it doesn't require proof of citizenship.

Seven: Small business owners are afraid they will have to lay off people or shut their doors altogether if they

are hit with more new taxes. What is the plan to protect small business from bearing the brunt of new taxes for this health care idea?

Madam Speaker, these are seven of the questions I have been asked by the people I represent, and I would hope the President could address some them and questions by other Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, does anyone really believe that big government can do a better job of running health care? It is a glittering illusion to think our health care problems can be solved by more expensive, big-bureaucratic government. We do need reform, but a government takeover will only add to the problems we have now. We need to fix what is broken, not break what already works.

So, Madam Speaker, since our President is an innovator of new communication ideas, I respectfully submit that a townhall meeting between the President and Congress might just be the way to cut to the chase in this health care debate and allow the President time to answer the questions of the American people.

And that's just the way it is.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY IS THE ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, our economy is the issue. Today, the World Economic Forum released its annual Global Competitiveness Report. Switzerland has now replaced the United States as the most competitive economy in the world. The United States fell out of first place due to its weakened financial markets and macroeconomic instability.

This, Madam Speaker, is another wake-up call for our country, if anyone is listening. Due to the global economic crisis, precipitated by irresponsible U.S. financial institutions, nations throughout the world continue to struggle managing their financial futures.

Let's take note of an important fact: Switzerland maintains a positive trade balance, not a trade deficit. In 2008, Switzerland enjoyed a \$17 billion trade surplus, a third straight record year. And yet the nation is also now ranked as the most competitive in the world. We have almost a trillion-dollar trade deficit.

Now, think about this: Free trade fundamentalists here in the United States would say that it is not possible, that you can't be competitive while running an enormous trade surplus. Some of them even try to tell us that trade deficits are good.

Well, here in the United States, the free trade fundamentalists would have us believe we have to roll over for the Chinese or anyone else who wants to dominate our domestic market in order

to be competitive. But facts are facts. Switzerland is both the world's most economically competitive nation, according to the World Economic Forum, while enjoying an enormous trade surplus.

Madam Speaker, we have a lot of work to do here in our country and in this Congress to help our Nation regain its world-leading position in the competitiveness ranking. We now rank, shockingly, 108th in the world in the soundness of our banks. Switzerland fell in that category too, down to 44th, but not as far as the United States.

In regulation of securities exchanges, the United States ranked a dismal 47th in the world, compared to Switzerland's third-place ranking.

In property rights, Switzerland was first, and the United States 30th.

In infrastructure, that is, roads, bridges and so forth, Switzerland was first. The United States, 14th.

In math and science education, Switzerland was fifth and the United States 48th.

In infant mortality, the United States ranked 36th. Doesn't that speak to a decent health insurance program in this country?

In life expectancy, we were 30th. In the quality of primary education, 30th.

Madam Speaker, we have a lot of work to do. Our Nation is losing ground internationally. Second place overall isn't bad, but we have to make the necessary investments in our physical and social infrastructure or we will fall even further.

One the authors of the World Economic Report, Dr. Sala-i-Martin, a professor of economics at Columbia, put it this way: "Amid the present crisis, it is critical that policymakers not lose sight of long-term competitiveness fundamentals amid short-term urgencies. Competitive economies are those that have in place the factors driving productivity enhancements on which their present and future prosperity is built. A competitiveness-supporting economic environment can help national economies to weather business cycle downturns and ensure that the mechanisms enabling solid economic performance going into the future are in place."

We have a lot of work to do as a Congress. We need strong reform of the financial sector to restore strength to our banks, not cosmetic changes; we need investments in infrastructure and education; and we need health insurance reform. Our economic competitiveness as a nation and our ability to create jobs hang in the balance.

Madam Speaker, it is time for Congress to take the reins and stop this stampede of greed, to provide leadership that will help our Nation and help our people through these tough times. We want the United States to be a world leader again in job creation, innovation and economic competitiveness. We can do it, but not unless the financial industry is a part of the team, pulling in the same direction,

making our country stronger, not putting us further at risk, and not taking huge bonuses while 15 million Americans remain unemployed.

Madam Speaker, the economy is the issue. The American people know that. The President and Congress have our work cut out for us.

IMPLEMENTING A PROPER U.S. APPROACH TO HONDURAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern regarding the most recent strong-arm tactics of the U.S. Government to coerce the people of Honduras into accepting the return of former President Manuel Zelaya into power.

Have some U.S. officials forgotten what democracy really is? Democracy does not belong to nor is defined by one man nor one government. It cannot survive without respect for the rule of law. Yet this has been forgotten.

The U.S. and the international community failed the Honduran people and Honduran democracy as Zelaya violated the constitution and took unilateral actions to extend his hold on power. Our government said and did nothing as democracy came under attack in the months leading up to Zelaya's removal from office. Yet when the Honduran Supreme Court, the Attorney General, the National Congress and the human rights ombudsman took the necessary steps in accordance with the constitutional tenets, then the U.S. and the amorphous international community quickly sprung into action to defend Zelaya and punish Honduran democratic institutions and virtually all of Honduran civil society.

With no apparent regard for U.S. security or political or economic interests, the United States is doing all we can to ensure that Zelaya is put back in charge. The U.S. has terminated millions of dollars in U.S. assistance to the people of Honduras. We have stopped critical counternarcotics cooperation. We have suspended necessary visa services. Last week, the State Department declared that the presidential elections to be held in late November in Honduras will not be recognized unless Zelaya is returned to power.

As the U.S. has been employing its harshest tactics against the Honduran government and the Honduran people, the U.S. has also at the same time eased restrictions on the Cuban dictatorship, pushed for engagement and dialogue with the Cuban, Syrian and Iranian regimes, while failing to hold Chavez and Correa accountable for the blatant violations of freedom of expression and other fundamental rights of their citizens.

The U.S. has crossed a dangerous threshold by announcing, as I stated, that we will not acknowledge the upcoming Honduran elections unless the

current democratic government of Honduras accepts Zelaya's return to power. This threat not only deliberately ignores the rule of law and the checks and balances carefully crafted in the Honduran constitution to prevent the rise of tyranny, but it also seeks to replace them with mandates from outside actors who are carrying water for Chavez, for Castro, for Zelaya and the like. The U.S. position undermines the fundamental right of the Honduran people to elect their own leaders in multiparty, transparent democratic elections, free from coercion.

How our present course of action serves our interests or supports Honduran democracy remains an important yet unanswered question. Elliot Abrams, currently at the Council of Foreign Relations and a former official with the Reagan Administration, recently wrote it was Zelaya who wanted to mess around with that election and hold a referendum on that date, allowing him to be reelected in perpetuity, just as his mentor Chavez had done in Venezuela, and now that Hondurans want to go back to regular elections, what does the U.S. do? The United States won't allow them to do so.

The presidential candidates in Honduras, Madam Speaker, have not changed since Zelaya was removed from office. The dates of the election have not changed. The presidential term has not been moved or modified. The Supreme Electoral Tribunal is taking steps to ensure that this is the most transparent election in Honduran history.

□ 2015

The U.S. should be assisting rather than undermining the preparations for the upcoming elections to ensure that there is no interference with the democratic electoral process in Honduras. Mary Anastasia O'Grady of the Wall Street Journal wrote, "A lot of Hondurans believe that the U.S. isn't using its brass knuckles to serve their democratic aspirations at all, but quite the opposite, the aspirations of a neighborhood thug. Though some in our country believe that being popular among Latin America's left-wing dictators is the key to a successful U.S. policy in our hemisphere, freedom must be and must remain our driving force." Freedom, Madam Speaker. If it is not, the U.S. would have not only forgotten the meaning of democracy but would have forgotten what our Nation is, what we stand for and what defines us. Freedom.

HONORING ERNIE HARWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, I quote:

"For, lo, the winter is past,
The rain is over and gone;

The flowers appear on the earth;

The time of the singing of birds is come,

And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land."

Every April, we Michiganders heard Ernie Harwell recite these lines from the Song of Solomon from his broadcast booth; and we welcomed him and another season of Detroit Tigers baseball back into our homes. Ernie Harwell is not only a part of our culture; he is a part of our families.

For 42 summers around radios and sand lots throughout Michigan and America, Ernie's voice embodied and expressed the grace, skill, triumphs and travails of the greatest of American games—baseball. Everyone either tried or knew someone who tried to mimic his legendary calls of "long gone," "he stood there like a house by the side of the road," or "that foul ball was caught by a youngster from"—and on pins and needles we'd wait to hear from what city the lucky fan hailed. Of course, down inside we knew no one, including Ernie, knew where the fan was from, but it didn't matter. We knew where Ernie's heart was. It was and is with baseball and with us.

But a heart as big as Ernie's is not confined solely to Detroit or to baseball. Across the country, generations of sports fans grew up listening to Ernie. He announced games for both NCAA and pro football teams; for the Masters golf tournament in his native State of Georgia; for the Major League Baseball All Star Game and World Series; for the Brooklyn Dodgers, New York Giants, Baltimore Orioles, and yes, for the Detroit Tigers, who, in gratitude and admiration, placed Ernie's statue in the main concourse at Comerica Park.

Yes, Ernie is also a part of the Detroit Tigers' family, as Tiger Hall of Famer Al Kaline affirmed: "Ernie is probably the most beloved person who has ever been in Detroit with the Detroit Tigers. He is loved by everybody and rightfully so. He's a great broadcaster, but an even better person."

Yet while we and the Tigers and sports fans across the Nation embrace him, no one, of course, loves Ernie more than his wife of 68 years, Lulu, and their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. So blessed with their love and support, and faithful and thankful to God for bestowing this bounty upon him, Ernie now courageously faces the recent diagnosis that he is afflicted with incurable bile duct cancer. Viewing his condition not as an end, but as a beginning, Ernie says, "Whatever's in store, I'm ready for a new adventure. That's the way I look at it."

Madam Speaker, may we all honor this man, savor his company amongst us in the time God grants, and greet all of our lives' challenges with the faith, equanimity and dignity of Ernie Harwell.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ESCALATION OF THE CZARS DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. With the embarrassing demise of Mr. JONES, the czars debate has escalated even beyond where it was when we left for the July break. Depending on how you count, there are some 30 czars. It's been said, in many different places actually, that there are more czars in this administration than the Romanovs who ruled Russia for three centuries had czars. There's an energy czar, an urban czar, an infotech czar, a faith-based czar, a TARP czar, a stimulus accountability czar, a non-proliferation czar, a terrorism czar, a regulatory czar, a Guantanamo closure czar, a climate czar, a cyberspace czar, many more. They even had for a while a de facto car czar, Steve Ratner, who wasn't a czar but ultimately he became the car czar even though initially they said there wasn't going to be a car czar.

Now, the challenge here is that this appears to be an extra-constitutional approach. Now, the Constitution says government officers with significant authority, principal officers of the government, are to be appointed by the President subject to approval by the Senate.

Now, this has been interpreted, with the expansion of government, even to go five layers down; that they're expected to have delineated duties, deputy secretaries, assistant deputy secretaries, directors of different offices, come up to congressional committees, come up to the Hill, if not actually to get approved by the Senate, but at least to be accountable for what they do. We have it in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, we call in many of these different people who have all sorts of delineated duties.

Now, a clear way to avoid the checks and balances of this system is to put them under the White House rather than having a delineated position. This gives them potentially a consulting position as though they were a policy person at the White House, even though they're moving through the bureaucracy. The motive behind this obviously is that many things are not just in one department. For example, almost any of these different categories; obviously faith-based czar, there are departments in each part of the administration. TARP crossed multiple things. Terrorism crosses many of the departments. So the question is, when you have a traditional line structure, what do you do when you have things kind of stove-piped, and how do you interrelate with this?

Well, it's one thing to have advisers in the White House. Quite frankly, the Bush administration was pushing the edges of this in their faith-based office that went from an office inside the White House to then appointing a faith-based office in each department that then the faith-based policy person had some influence over, although it wasn't as direct.

By calling somebody a czar presumably means they have the power of the President to go behind and use their staff authority as though they were line, which is exactly what the founding fathers were debating about. There's a great new book, *Plain Honest Men—The Making of the American Constitution*, by Richard Beeman, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania. It's the first update probably in about 30 years of actual minutes, letters and things during the constitutional debates. And one thing through that book you constantly see is they couldn't agree on what powers the President was supposed to have. They went back and forth. Alexander Hamilton got so mad because he wanted it to be a permanent position that went basically for life, like a Supreme Court Justice, and he stormed out of the convention for nearly 30 days, only came back to sign it. So clearly there was a debate, and Hamilton lost, for accountability and a checks and balances of the system. And the czar approach is avoiding those checks and balances.

Now, my friend and colleague, Congressman KINGSTON has introduced a bill, the Czar Accountability and Reform Act, the CZAR Act, that has three simple points to it. The person has to have advice and consent of the Senate. He is to not be exempted from the competitive service by reason of confidentiality, policy-determining, policy-making or public-advocating character, which is kind of the debates we've had on the task forces around health care. With the former President Clinton it came up in multiple debates in the last White House where they say that Congress can't get e-mail oversight, we can't call certain people up because it's a policy-making decision, advice to the President. This bill would say it doesn't apply to a czar.

And also if they perform or delegate functions which but for the establishment of such task force, council, or similar office would be performed or delegated by an individual in a position to which the President appoints an individual by and with advice and consent of the Senate, which basically means a czar can't take authorities from people who would have been approved by the Senate.

Now, we actually have a model for this. It's the Office of the National Drug Control Policy. The so-called drug czar was the first czar. But we actually have legislation that guides his budget, that even gives the duties and delineation of his duties and the deputy director's duties and other people underneath it. It says which things he

has line authority for. As chairman of the committee that did the last five-year reauthorization of this, we had all sorts of how high-intensity drug trafficking areas are supposed to be used; the national youth anti-drug media campaign; the counter drug technology assessment center. We had appropriations for his staff and how much he would have for his staff and how much for his appropriations. We had specifics on how he was going to relate to the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Attorney General, homeland security, defense. We had guidelines of what reports come to Congress and of the different relevant committees. Because while Government Reform had primary jurisdiction over the drug czar, it also went to Judiciary, to Energy and Commerce and other committees, so there were different reporting strategies. In fact, czar was a slang term up until this administration.

For example, in high intensity drug trafficking area it says, "Designation—The director, upon consultation with the Attorney General, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Homeland Security, heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies and the Governor of each applicable State may designate any specified area of the United States as a high-intensity drug trafficking area." That's explicit. That's not somebody wandering around with undefined authority. He's got a specific budget and so on.

Here's the great irony. We had one czar who was in the cabinet, approved with the advice and consent of the Senate with a specific budget. And our current director of the Office of National Drug Control, Gil Kerlikowski, is a good man and would have been clearly cleared. But this administration chose to take the one czar that was approved with advice and consent of the Senate and take him out of the Cabinet, and now he's not certified either. So now even the one czar who has descriptions, who was following the pattern under this administration, has been changed. And the danger here is we do not know how the interrelationships between the people cleared by the United States Senate are working with noncleared people. We run into background check problems like Mr. JONES. But we run into other huge questions, and that is so much power centered in one place that's not accountable to Congress, that it's not even clear how we do oversight of that function.

I criticized the last administration when they did too much of this and we had some back and forth about why they wouldn't appear in front of the different committees, even on policy advisers. We need to have direct, aggressive oversight in this House and in the Senate to find out how this is working, how decisions are being made, who's commanding what, and are the people now running the agencies' hands tied. The people who we delineated their duties, who were cleared with ad-

vice and consent of the Senate, are their hands now tied by a bunch of people who haven't gone through this process, who haven't been vetted, who do not have clear line authority, but are using the staff power coming out of the President of the United States to usurp the constitutional power of those who are designated principal officers and commanded by the Constitution to report to the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. ING-LIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INGLIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, I believe that we can all agree the health care reform proposals ignited debates in homes and workplaces all over the country. The intense interest in health care policy by so many Americans made this August district work period unusually exciting. My offices were busy taking phone calls, e-mails, and having people drop by voicing their concerns. This healthy health care debate has led many Americans to become involved in politics for the first time.

Whenever we in Congress do something really important, we need to get outside the Beltway because that's where the great wisdom in our country lies. All of us in the Congress share three goals for health care reform legislation: We want to make health care insurance more affordable and accessible. We want to improve the quality of health care. We want to reduce the cost of health care. Where we disagree is how to accomplish these goals.

I would like to share some of what I did and learned concerning health care over the recess period. As a scientist and engineer, I seek out the facts to guide my decisions. I also earned my master's and doctorate degrees in human physiology, the basic medical science.

□ 2030

This training led me to a 20-year career teaching anatomy and physiology to both medical and nursing students. That's why one of the things I did and that my staff did was to read the House leadership bill, H.R. 3200, and the amendments by three House committees.

I'm very proud that so many of my constituents were also interested in learning what proposed health care reform bills would do and exactly what they say. That's why I posted on my Web site the House Majority Bill 3200 with information about the approved amendments.

I also posted on my Web site an alternative bill that I support, H.R. 3400, the Empowering Patients First Act, developed out of suggestions by my colleagues in the Republican Study Committee. For those constituents without computer access, I provided hard copies of these bills to eight libraries and my four district offices.

Besides reading legislation, I also engaged in a lot of listening and dialogue. I visited with local doctors in my district to get their perspective about health care.

At the recommendation of one of my constituents, Dr. John Vitarello, who is a cardiologist who practices at Frederick Memorial Hospital in my district, I toured the cardiac catheterization "cath" labs at Washington Adventist Hospital on August 27. I was invited to tour the lab by Dr. Mark Turco, an interventional cardiologist. Dr. Turco is also a leader of the three-member physician team from Washington Adventist Hospital which volunteered to supervise and assist a joint training venture for physicians in Frederick Memorial Hospital so they could also perform innovative procedures in cath labs that shorten patients' recoveries and hospital stays compared to traditional surgical repairs.

While I was there in scrubs and mask, I observed a procedure called an endograft. An endograft is an innovative procedure in this case used to repair an aneurysm in the patient's aorta.

In the image-guided endovascular repair, a stent graft, a woven polyester tube with a metallic skeleton, was compressed inside a carrier catheter. While viewed on an x-ray monitor, the endograft was inserted through a small incision in the patient's groin and threaded through the catheter through arteries to the site of the aneurysm. The stent graft was then placed across the aneurysm and released. As the stent graft expanded, it gripped the normal arterial wall on both ends of the aneurysm, bypassing the bulge from the inside.

As I observed this procedure, I marveled at both the advances of our medical research and technology as well as the dedication in caring for human lives represented by this joint venture between Frederick Memorial Hospital and Washington Adventist Hospital. This procedure cuts down the recovery time for patients as well as the time required for patients to be in the hospital.

One of my greatest concerns about health care reform is that we don't curtail the innovations in health care that are invented predominantly here in the United States.

There is also a lot of concern about competition in health care. Competition is important. Competition always does two things: It drives down costs and increases quality. However, there is also a lot of cooperation in medical care today. Here, I observed physicians at one hospital helping physicians at another local hospital to increase the availability, the competition, for innovative medical treatments that benefit patients with improved outcome and less time in the hospital.

I am 83 years old. I have seen in my own career and life and that of my family that innovation in modern medicine, American style, moves at an astonishing speed. It is this innovation that has so improved the quality of our lives as well as extending the lifespans of Americans.

By far, the most enlightening and informative exercise was three nights of teletownhalls that I held during the break. On two nights, Dr. John Vitarello joined me as a guest for these townhall meetings. Over 180,000 telephone calls were placed; almost 20,000 people were home and listened to some part of the townhall.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the prescription for health care reform in the present bill will make it worse and more expensive. These changes are the opposite of what we need and Americans want.

HONORING BILL HEFNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KISSELL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is truly with mixed emotions that I rise tonight on the floor of the House of Representatives. It's a sadness in noting that last week we lost Congressman W.G. Bill Hefner, a Congressman from North Carolina for 24 years from 1974 to 1998. And we truly give our condolences and our regards to his daughters Stacye and Shelly and to his wonderful wife, Nancy.

But the legacy of Bill Hefner did not end last week, as we're going to see tonight as we spend some time remembering and talking about and telling stories of Bill Hefner, that his memory will go forth because of the things he did, the person he was, and the Congressman that represented his district in North Carolina so well.

Now, I have to tell you, Madam Speaker, that tonight I shall refer to Congressman Hefner as "Mr. Hefner" quite often because I was raised in a time and a place when the ultimate respect that you could give to someone is to call him "Mister." And while his wonderful, loving, lovely wife, Nancy, convinced me that I could call her "Nancy," I could not bring myself to call Bill Hefner anything but "Mr. Hefner" because that's the respect that people in the district had for him.

And, Madam Speaker, as some might be saying, you know, Why is a freshman Congressman from North Carolina the first one to speak tonight? It's because Bill Hefner, Mr. Hefner, was my Congressman from the Eighth District of North Carolina. And with all of the reconfiguring that took place from time to time in my home county, Montgomery County, North Carolina, was always in Mr. Hefner's district. And it was the way that Mr. Hefner represented us and, once again, who he was that we want to talk about tonight.

Madam Speaker, I believe that one of the greatest ways we can remember is by telling stories, and tonight we're going to talk about Mr. Hefner. And I have several colleagues and friends of not only myself but who knew Mr. Hefner at the time, and they have been so generous with their time to be here tonight to help us remember.

And I just want to start out very briefly by just letting the story of Bill Hefner be told a little bit.

Bill Hefner was born in Tennessee. He went to Alabama. He was a son of a sharecropper. He saw that his way out of poverty was through a gift that he had been given by God, and that's through the singing of gospel music. And he was very good, and he received an invitation to come to North Carolina.

And this was the time period of the late 1950s and early 1960s where television was much different than it is today, when there was only just a few stations there in North Carolina, and they often filled their time in the afternoon with gospel singing.

And Mr. Hefner was so good and his group was so good that they were asked to be part of three television stations in North Carolina. Now, we didn't have that many stations, so this was a great majority of the stations that were represented, and he became known to the people in North Carolina with his group, The Harvesters.

He eventually was successful enough and a good businessman that he bought a radio station. And at some point in time, a former Congressman came in and was interviewed by Mr. Hefner, and Mr. Hefner went home and told his wife, You know, I believe I can do that, because Mr. Hefner had never been elected to a public office, never sought public office. He was the president of his PTA and that was his background, but his background was much stronger. He had the background of knowing the people of his district.

So he went out, Madam Speaker, and he ran for Congress. And without any political background other than knowing the people and caring about the people and having a sense of who the people were, he was elected in a landslide.

So that's the background as to this man W.G. Bill Hefner that I want everybody to be aware of.

Now we want to fill it in with some personal stories, and I would like to

start out by recognizing DAVID OBEY from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Let me simply say that I see Bill in two ways. First of all, I see him as a legislator. He was a good, solid legislator, a member of the Appropriation's Committee, and I watched him day after day conduct his business with grace and with courage. It was not popular to oppose some of the tax and budget proposals that President Reagan was pushing, for instance, in the 1980s. I know in my district at the time, 70 percent of the country favored those changes. Bill Hefner had courage enough to point out that the numbers just didn't add up and that he carried on his conviction, and eventually facts proved him to be correct.

Bill was also a person who respected this institution. He respected the Congress, he respected the country, he respected his party, he respected the other party, and he respected virtually every person in this institution, and it showed in the way he dealt with others in this body.

But my greatest and fondest memory of Bill is rooted in his gospel singing. I happen to like bluegrass, and I belong to a bluegrass band called The Capitol Offenses, and I learned to love gospel music. And on many occasions, Bill would sing and I and members of my band would back him up. And I have to say, he was one of the best singers we ever performed with. He knew a wide range of gospel but he also had a solid voice, and he had fun doing it. He loved it, and anyone who listened to him knew that he loved it.

He was a man of courage. He had a terrific sense of humor, and he could find a lot of ways to get things done by simply charming people in this place. If logic wouldn't work, if substance wouldn't work, there was always the Hefner charm to push things over the edge.

□ 2045

I was greatly saddened to learn of his death last week. I have to say that I am proud to have served in the same institution with a man of his courage, with a man of his integrity, and with a man of his good humor. I'm certain that he will be missed by his family and his friends. I very much am grateful for the fact that I was able to know him and to work with him for all of those years. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. KISSELL. Thank you, Mr. OBEY. I would like to add there about Mr. Hefner and his showbiz background. One of the descriptions that was given of Mr. Hefner at one time that I think he enjoyed the most was that it would be recognized that he had a showbiz background, but he was a workhorse, not a show horse. That summed his career up very appropriately, and he did enjoy that comparison.

His humor and his ability to charm were pointed out to me one time on the

House floor. Evidently, there was quite a serious debate taking place between two sides of the aisle, and Mr. Hefner somehow got the attention, Madam Speaker, of the Speaker at the time, and got the attention of the full House and looked at his watch and supposedly said, How much longer is this going to go on? Because I have to get home to watch the "Andy Griffith Show." And in North Carolina there is no higher calling than to go watch the "Andy Griffith Show."

At this point in time, I would like to yield to CHET EDWARDS of Texas for the time he may consume.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I consider myself blessed to have known Congressman Bill Hefner. He was a good, decent and caring person, and I will miss him dearly. While this man of faith has gone on to a better place now, his work here on Earth will continue to enrich the lives of millions of American citizens. There are untold thousands of our troops and families who are living in better housing today because Bill Hefner was their champion. He not only worked hard for his beloved Fort Bragg, North Carolina; he fought for a better quality of life for servicemen and -women and their families wherever they might live in the world. As chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Chairman Hefner saw to it that the service and sacrifice of our troops would be honored in a meaningful way.

While Members of Congress sometimes take ourselves too seriously, Bill Hefner was a voice of self-deprecating humor and humility. He took his work seriously, but never himself too seriously. In doing so, he helped us keep our proper perspective on ourselves and our work here. He used to joke that he had worked hard for over 20 years to take a perfectly safe Democratic seat in North Carolina and turn it into a marginal one. That was a reflection of his humor and his humility, because the truth was that any political challenges that Bill Hefner might have ever faced were because he was a person of courage.

As Mr. OBEY pointed out, in 1981 he was one of the very few Southern Democrats who voted against the popular Reagan tax cuts because he felt they would lead to large Federal deficits and ultimately undermine programs important to everyday working Americans. As long as I knew him, he always did what he thought was right for his district, for our great country and for average working families.

In an age of special interests, Bill Hefner's cause was to fight for the interests of everyday, hardworking families, the kind of people who fight our fires, protect our streets, defend our shores, educate our children and make our factories run. He believed to his core in the dignity of hardworking everyday American citizens.

Even after he retired from Congress, Bill would often call me, and he called

when he was concerned that the views of working Americans were not being considered in Washington, D.C. Whether in office or out of office, Bill Hefner lived his faith by always being his brother's keeper.

Bill Hefner was a special personal friend and a mentor to me. While I cannot fill his shoes or come close to it, I'm a better Congressman and a better person for having known him and having learned from him. I cherish the many, many personal conversations we had right here on the floor, Madam Speaker. I will always be grateful to the very sage advice he gave me on a golf course one day when he and I happened to be partnered against then-President Clinton and the President's partner, when on the 15th hole in a very close match, the President had about a 3½-foot putt. I was not going to give it to the President, and Chairman Hefner called me over and put me under his arm and said, Son, let me just tell you something. Right now we have this line item veto in existence, and the Military Construction bill is sitting on the President's desk for signature, and you represent Fort Hood. I gave the President his putt, and the Fort Hood soldiers got their barracks thanks to the sage advice of Bill Hefner.

The moment of so many wonderful moments, but the moment I shall never forget, was on June 4 of 1998 when Bill Hefner stood in this very same spot. We were debating an issue of the school prayer constitutional amendment. And I, consistent with my belief in the constitutional principle of church-State separation, was opposing the Istook constitutional amendment. During that process I was personally attacked by one particular faith-based group that claimed by not wanting to amend the First Amendment to the Constitution I was somehow un-American and even worse yet, I was accused of being un-Texan. Leave it to Bill Hefner, the man of the South, the gentleman from North Carolina who sang gospel music his entire life, a man of deep faith, leave it to him to come to this very spot to stand up and defend the integrity of his colleague who had been challenged. That was Bill Hefner, a man of deepest integrity. And that is why I will always revere him and what he stood for.

To Stacey and Shelly, his daughters, and to Nancy, his widow, I would simply say that if my two sons had every right to be half as proud of me as you have a right to be proud of your father and your husband, I would consider my life a success.

May God forever keep our friend, our colleague, and a great American, Bill Hefner, forever in His loving arms. Thank you.

Mr. KISSELL. Madam Speaker, to kind of point out the legacy of how Mr. Hefner influenced people continues today to reflect that, I had not been sworn in but a matter of hours before I got a phone call from Representative

EDWARDS telling me what a great influence that Bill Hefner was on him and how that mentorship and role model is not forgotten. It continues from year to year to year.

At this point in time, I would like to yield to our friend from South Carolina, Representative JOHN SPRATT.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I came here in 1983. And as I did, Bill Hefner was just coming into his own. Speaking of his name, you want to call him only "Mr. Hefner." I will never forget one night we got on an airplane, as we did many nights, US Airways, and someone spoke to him as Congressman this and Congressman that. And the stewardess said, I didn't know you were a Member of Congress. What's your name? He said, Bill Hefner. She said, I don't believe I've ever heard of you. He said, well, you probably know my brother Hugh. He was always ready for a quip like that.

I rise to salute this wonderful guy with great sadness learning of his passing. I didn't know him well, but I knew him when I came here because from the time I was a boy I had watched the Harvesters on WBTV in Charlotte, North Carolina, right after Arthur Smith. He was the lead tenor on the Harvesters, and they were good. And they stayed that good harmonizing for the next 50 years. You couldn't beat them. They were just top rate.

HOWARD COBLE got into a little fray with Bill sometime back because he went into his district and spoke against him in an election. Next election, Bill returned the compliment. This time, he was not speaking, though, he was singing. He went in and made three to four gospel singing experiences and packed the houses and everything, and HOWARD called him up and said, I was awfully surprised to see you come directly into my district. He said, HOWARD, you came into my district. Let's just have this understanding. If you come back, next time, I'm not coming in by myself. I'm bringing the whole quartet and we're going to sing you right out of that seat, too. From there after, they had a mutual accord that the one would stay out of the other's district. That's the kind of guy this is that we're talking about, a wonderful guy.

He put on the airs of being a populist sometimes, but he was a lot smarter than he put on, and a lot richer for that matter. He looked at the Reagan tax cuts that probably would have profited him and a lot of his constituents, and said, it's not the right time. It will only add to the deficit. And he was proven only too right. We were debating in our caucus one morning years ago another tax cut that was not nearly the same size, and he finally got up and said, I don't know why we are spending so much time talking about this tax cut. It ain't going to benefit anybody but two people in this caucus. One of them is Norm Sisisky, and the other is JOHN SPRATT.

I got up and I said, point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, this poor-

mouthed populist owns the second largest Cadillac dealership in North Carolina and a radio station in Concord. He loved it. He never let me forget it. He never jumped me again for benefitting from tax cuts either.

He became a voice that people listened to because he could get up and speak to something and go right to the pith of it. It's really a gift. He had that gift. As I said, he was a lot smarter than he let on being.

One of my favorite recollections of Bill's debate, we were debating the B2 bomber. He got up and said, you know, if this bomber is so stealthy as everybody says it is and you can't see it, you can't find it, radar can't even see it, what I would suggest is we save ourselves \$50 billion. Let's don't build it, but let's tell the Russians we have built it, and they will go crazy trying to find it. That's the kind of humor he brought to the people's House, talking like that all the time with a humorous cover to it but a for-real serious substance to it as well.

He was a great guy. This place has been known through the centuries as the House of the people. Bill Hefner helped this House earn its reputation as a House of the people. We will miss him greatly. He served here with real distinction. He deserves every word of praise being said about him tonight.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. KISSELL. Thank you, Mr. SPRATT.

Madam Speaker, if we had opened this up to everybody who knew Congressman Hefner who could have been here tonight, we couldn't have come close to getting this in within an hour. There are so many people that he affected, and I certainly appreciate the colleagues that are with us tonight.

Next I would like to recognize a fellow Congressman from North Carolina, Mr. DAVID PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleagues for scheduling this time tonight for us to remember our friend and colleague, Bill Hefner, to honor his memory.

I first got to know Bill when I came to this body in 1987. He was already a fairly senior Member. He became an important mentor to me and a valued friend and colleague. As many have said already, Bill came from a humble background. He never lost touch with working people. He had a natural empathy and understanding of people who were struggling in life, great sympathy for the underdog. He was a man of great compassion, and that compassion was not feigned. It was something that came naturally to Bill, an innate sense, I think, in Bill, of fairness and decency. There is not going to be a speaker here tonight, I promise you, that doesn't refer to Bill's sense of humor. He was the funniest man probably that ever served in this Chamber. He could cut through tense moments in these overheated debates in a way that was a marvel to behold.

Sometimes, as Mr. EDWARDS said, he showed great courage in the way he

dealt with those debates. I have a memory very similar to CHET EDWARDS. This one comes earlier when I had been here only a year or so. It was a debate of the so-called "Grove City" bill which was a proposal that unfortunately would have put an adverse interpretation on civil rights laws. And it was a bill the effect of which was being greatly exaggerated by a prominent figure of the religious right of that time. He said that if this bill was passed, churches would have to, and I'm quoting him here, to hire a practicing active homosexual drug addict with AIDS to be a teacher or youth pastor.

Well, Bill Hefner was watching this go on, and like all of us, he was getting his switchboard flooded with calls coming in alarmed about this from well-meaning people who didn't know what to make of this. I wrote a book a couple of years later and remembered, looked back at this episode because it impressed me so much at the time. In my chapter on religion and politics, I quoted Bill Hefner, what he said coming to this floor and cutting through that debate, and the words I'm going to read don't do justice to the effect he had just in his commonsense way. Bill said, I find reprehensible not those thousands of people who have made the phone calls, but the people that have instigated this misinformation. If it means I lose my position in the U.S. House of Representatives if I do not cave in and base my vote on what people believe to be true but what I know not to be true, I say to my colleagues, this job is not worth that to me. I remembered that and looked it up. And it still stands for me as a memory of effective debate in this House, effective not just rhetorically but because of its being said from the heart and its being said with true conviction.

Bill was a member of the Appropriations Committee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, a champion of our servicemen and -women, of their housing and of their quality of life. An elementary school at Fort Bragg bears his name, as does the Salisbury Veterans Administration Hospital.

Bill was a mentor to many of us. He gave me pep talks on more than one difficult vote. He could put everything in perspective. I valued that mentorship, that support, and that encouragement.

□ 2100

He helped me get on the Appropriations Committee, and then he helped me figure out how to get things done once I got on the Appropriations Committee.

He was a mainstay of our delegation, one of our most influential Members, yes, but also a Member who helped us all stick together, whom we all liked and respected. We enjoyed his company. And I think it's fair to say that Bill's role in our delegation has never quite been filled since he left.

I remember very well the dinner that was given for Bill shortly before his retirement. The Harvesters Quartet, pretty elderly gentlemen by that time, they were gathered from all over the country, they came in and sang one more time. And Bill's friends and associates and colleagues got up one after the other and told many stories like those we heard tonight. It was one of the most enjoyable and heart-warming evenings I have ever experienced in this city or anywhere else.

So I'm pleased to join tonight in honoring Bill, in recalling our friendship, our common labors with him. He served North Carolina and this Nation faithfully and well in ways that continue to inspire.

Mr. KISSELL. Thank you, DAVID. And I think, as was just pointed out, that while we have memories of Mr. Hefner and how he could turn serious conversations with humor and charm, that when necessary he stood up for his beliefs and effectively stated those in a way that spoke of the core being that he was.

Madam Speaker, I would like to next recognize another gentleman from North Carolina, Representative BOB ETHERIDGE.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative KISSELL, for organizing this Special Order this evening for a good friend and, as all of you already heard, a 12-term Member of this body.

Bill Hefner, who passed away on Wednesday, September 2 of this year, provided a selfless service to our State of North Carolina and to this Nation, as you heard from a number of my colleagues already. But in his passing, we've lost a good friend; North Carolina has lost an outstanding citizen and a man who was instrumental not only in this body, but in his community, in his State, in everything he did; Nancy has lost a devoted husband; and Stacy and Shelly have lost a loving father. He was a grandfather, also, who loved children. You've heard he was a native of Tennessee.

The first time I remember meeting Bill Hefner was more years ago than either one of us want to admit. I was running for State superintendent, and if you run in North Carolina, it's an elected office. So you run, and anybody who has a good size group, you wanted to be there. And I went to the Eighth District, they were having an Eighth District rally. And it was the largest group I went to I think all year, other than one where all the educators get together, and Bill Hefner was doing his own singing at his own rally. And I note that's the most unusual political rally I had ever been to.

I heard of Bill, but I hadn't met him. I learned very quickly he knew how to politic in a unique way. Those people who left that gospel sing that he was singing at, it made no difference to them whether he was Democrat, Republican, liberal, or conservative; they loved Bill Hefner. He was their man.

And there were people at that rally I didn't see at any other rally I went to all year. It was because he had a message. They believed in him, and he made a difference in their lives.

Yes, he was president and owner of a radio station, and he made a difference. And he was a bright person, much smarter than he wanted to admit. And yes, he had more resources than he would ever acknowledge. You would think he was the poorest guy in the room if you were around him, but he did okay.

He was the leader of the Harvesters Quartet, yes, but the last time I remember hearing Bill sing—I enjoyed the meeting as Congressman PRICE talked about—he came to my district, held a gospel sing, and he called me ahead of time to let me know he was going to be there. He said, Now if you can be available, you might want to show up. He said, I might say a good word for you. Well, I recognized if Bill came to your district, you better show up—he filled up the Civic Center. And Bill enjoyed that as much as he loved his family, as he loved being in this body. And he was a businessman at heart because as soon as he finished on that stage he was selling those cassettes. He had a delightful time and the people loved him. But that was Bill Hefner. Bill Hefner enjoyed what he was doing, whether he was legislating or whether he was singing or telling a good story.

As I came to know Bill over the years—and I only served with him here two—I understood that his political service really was an extension of his gospel singing, which really was what he loved to do. He cared about people. He cared about what he did. But he cared about his religion. And both of those were powerful ways for him to serve his fellow man.

Many of the members of the North Carolina delegation, as you already heard from Congressman PRICE, learned the ropes of effectively advocating for our constituents here in Washington from Bill. When I first came—any Member who is a freshman here, you get a lot better services now than you did when I came 14 years ago, even though people tried to help you—Bill was the first one to offer. He said, If you need a place to meet with folks, you can use my office.

Well, you know, somebody who is coming up here, hadn't been to Washington much even though I served at the State level, that meant a lot. He opened the doors of his office; I used it to meet constituents and other people. But that's what Bill Hefner was about; he was about making you feel at home. He led by example, both as a public official and later as a private citizen.

He was known for his passionate support of our military veterans, as you've already heard this evening. He only represented Fort Bragg in the last few years it was in his district of his years here in Congress, but he represented them every day as a Member of this

body. And that's why you have a school on that base named for him and you have military hospitals named for him, because they knew that Bill Hefner was a friend of veterans, he was a friend of the small business owners, and as you've heard this evening, he really was a friend of the working poor as well as the working class.

His life of service will continue to inspire all that knew him. And his love for North Carolina can be seen through his work on our highways, in our schools, in our veterans hospitals, and yes, in the laws that he helped pass in this body.

He retired from Congress almost a decade ago, but his work and influence will not be forgotten. He was a respected legislator, a dedicated public servant, and a great North Carolinian. It is fitting that we honor Bill Hefner and his family this evening.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague Representative KISSELL for organizing this Special Order in honor of a good friend and twelve-term Member of this House of Representatives. Former Eighth District Congressman Bill Hefner, who passed away on Wednesday, September 2, 2009, provided selfless service to our State of North Carolina and to this Nation. In his passing, I lost a friend and North Carolina lost an outstanding citizen; a man who was instrumental in his community, county, State, and country.

A native of Elora, Tennessee, Bill moved to North Carolina after graduating from the University of Alabama and became the president and owner of radio station WRKB in Kannapolis from 1954 to 1967.

I met Bill Hefner at a political rally in North Carolina decades ago while he was with the radio station. He was the lead singer in the 'Harvesters Quartet', a gospel music group, and he led that political rally with his voice because he just loved to sing. As I came to know him through the years, I understood that his political service was an extension of his gospel singing. Both were powerful ways for him to be of service to his fellow man.

Many members of the North Carolina congressional delegation learned the ropes of effectively advocating for our constituents while in Washington, DC, from Bill Hefner. Bill led by example, both as a public official and later as a private citizen. Congressman Hefner was known for his passionate support for military veterans. In fact, the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Salisbury, North Carolina, was named in his honor in 1999. He was a friend to veterans, small business owners, the working poor, and the middle class. His life of service will continue to inspire all who knew him. His love for North Carolina can be seen through his work on our highways, our schools, our veterans' hospitals, and in our laws.

Bill Hefner retired from Congress almost a decade ago, but his work and influence will never be forgotten. He was a respected legislator, a dedicated public servant, and a great North Carolinian. It is fitting that we honor him and his family today.

Madam Speaker, I join his family and our State in mourning a great legislator and a tremendous human being. I yield back.

Mr. KISSELL. Thank you, BOB.

Madam Speaker, continuing the North Carolina trend, I would like to recognize Representative BRAD MILLER from North Carolina.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I also rise to honor Congressman Bill Hefner, and I appreciate Mr. KISSELL organizing this tribute tonight.

Congressman Hefner had a down-home style that never changed. Some folks in Washington thought it didn't really fit with their idea of what an influential Member of Congress, an effective Member of Congress is supposed to be like, but that was always their problem, not his problem. He never changed.

Everyone who spoke tonight has spoken of the Harvesters, his gospel music group that he continued to sing in. His political rallies continued to be gospel sings, the Harvesters performing. Now, that sounds like something out of the 1930s from the movie, "O Brother, Where Art Thou?", but this was still in the '90s that he was doing this. That was long past the era that was dominated by political consultants, smart guys who read polls and produced TV ads. And political rallies at that time were supposed to be three people who were sitting in front of their television when a political ad came on. During that period Bill Hefner was still doing political rallies that were gospel sings and packing large halls.

And it wasn't just at political rallies. He had the Harvesters come perform at veteran hospitals, including the one in Salisbury that is now named after him, and was very popular with the veterans who were in those hospitals. And he did become a great advocate for veterans, a great advocate for our men and women in uniform. He visited military installations, saw the conditions in which our military were living, and became a crusader for better housing for our troops.

Bill Hefner ran for Congress on the promise to be a spokesman, a representative, a voice for the common man. He remained faithful to that promise. He never changed. He was the same guy when he ended his service after 24 years, one of the most influential members of the Appropriations Committee, a subcommittee chairman, a cardinal. He was the same guy as he was when he was elected.

He understood working Americans because he was one. He may eventually have done very well, but that's where he started and that's where his heart always was. He always understood what life was like for ordinary Americans.

I am proud to be here tonight to honor Bill Hefner. And I am very grateful that he is an example for all of us who still represent North Carolina in Congress.

Mr. KISSELL. Madam Speaker, at this point in time I would like to recognize Majority Leader STENY HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, and my

friend, LARRY KISSELL, who is doing a wonderful job representing the District that Bill Hefner loved and whose people loved Bill Hefner, I came to Congress in 1981. Bill had been here for 6 or 7 years when I got here. He was on the Appropriations Committee; I went on the Appropriations Committee not too long after coming here.

Bill Hefner has been regaled by all of his friends from North Carolina. And I know Chairman OBEY, who served with Bill on the Appropriations Committee as I did for well over a decade, can tell, I'm sure, numerous stories late into the night about Bill Hefner. And what warm memories I have of Bill Hefner sitting on the aisle back here. And all my colleagues remember he would sit on the aisle and you would go by and Bill would sort of look up with a twinkle in his eye and he would tell you story after story after story.

I remember one night I was going to give a speech and I wanted a few jokes, so I called Bill Hefner up and he gave me a couple of jokes, and I used them, and they worked very well. So I can say Bill Hefner was my writer, I suppose. But he was a wonderful, wonderful representative, and he was a representative in the best sense of that term. He represented his people. He represented North Carolina. He represented his country. He represented the men and women in our Armed Forces whom he loved and whom he served with great fervor and affection. Bill Hefner loved his country, he loved his colleagues, and his colleagues loved Bill Hefner.

It's been talked about how he loved to play golf. I like to play golf as well—I'm not very good, but I love to play, like so many other hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of people in this country who like to say we play golf. We play at it, I suppose. But Bill was a good golfer. And he had a tournament down at Pinehurst every year. And I used to go down and play at Pinehurst with Bill. And you not only went down to play golf, you just went down to have this warm, gracious, outreaching human being make you feel good about serving with him in the Congress and make you feel good about North Carolina and your country.

Bill Hefner was a great resource of North Carolina. He then moved further south and became a county commissioner for a little bit, my good friend is telling me.

Bill Hefner will be missed. Bill Hefner used to tell me, he said, You know, STENY, I was elected in my district; it was a safe district then, and I've worked very hard and I've turned it into a marginal district.

I think you all heard him say that. That was one of his favorite sayings, LARRY.

□ 2115

Now, the good news for you, Mr. KISSELL, is you're going to do the opposite. You're going to take a district that could have gone either way, and

you're going to turn it into a safe district. I appreciate that, but nobody would have appreciated it more than Bill Hefner. My friend BRAD MILLER, a friend of Bill Hefner's and a colleague from North Carolina, told a story.

Bill Hefner was a singer. He was a real talent. He loved to sing, and he loved to entertain, and he loved to be a comedian, and he loved to make people, as I said, feel good. He accomplished that with great frequency and with great ability. We'll miss Bill Hefner. Bill Hefner was what's good about our country, which he loved so dearly.

As I said, he loved the men and women who served in the Armed Forces, and he served them so well as chairman of the Military Construction Committee. I remember I had the opportunity to travel to Germany and to some other NATO allies in Europe with him in the 1980s, and it was clear that he was extraordinarily knowledgeable about the needs of our men and women stationed overseas in terms of the quality of their lives. He mirrored IKE SKELTON or IKE SKELTON mirrors Bill Hefner in terms of his commitment to our men and women in the Armed Forces.

So I am pleased, LARRY KISSELL, to join you, your colleagues from North Carolina, my chairman—I served on the committee for 23 years—Chairman OBEY, and my good friend CHET EDWARDS, who now chairs the same subcommittee that Bill Hefner chaired. Bill was also a member of the Armed Services Committee, of course. So I thank you for letting me know that you were doing this Special Order to rise in memory, respect and deep affection for a wonderful American, for a wonderful advocate of his faith, for a wonderful family man, and for a wonderful Member of this body.

God blessed America when he gave us William G. Hefner. I yield back.

Mr. KISSELL. Thank you, STENY.

Madam Speaker, I am going to conclude now, but you don't finish when you talk about Bill Hefner, because, as we've seen tonight, the legacy will not end. It will continue for all the good things he did, but I want to talk a little bit about the personal side of Bill Hefner and what he meant to me.

There are all of these things we've heard tonight, and as I mentioned earlier, he was my Congressman. I must say that, while those many years he represented us, I wasn't involved in party politics. I never ran for public office like Mr. Hefner, and there came a time when I felt that maybe that was what people like me should do because that's what Bill Hefner had done. He was a man of the people. He recognized the working people, and he stood up for those people.

I said, you know, we have seen in our district, the wonderful Eighth District of North Carolina, that, if you go out to the people and if you tell them who you are and if they recognize in you the knowledge that you know who they are and if they know that you respect

them and that you are concerned about them, as we saw for 24 years, those people will reward you by sending you to Congress. So it was with knowledge of what Mr. Hefner had done that I ran for Congress. I come from a very small town, Biscoe, North Carolina—1,500 people—and needless to say, it wasn't exactly a turning moment in North Carolina politics when I announced that I would run for Congress. It is with the legacy, though, of Mr. Bill Hefner that people look to the person for what he says and not who he is and not where he comes from.

One time in my home county, Montgomery County, which is also a small county, President Bill Clinton was coming to visit our local hospital. He was accompanied by Mr. Hefner, and together they went visiting there in the hospital. I heard this story, and I think it kind of sums up everything about Bill Hefner. They went into the room. The President and Mr. Hefner went into the room of a patient's.

Mr. Hefner said, I'm Bill Hefner, and this is President Clinton.

The gentleman, the patient, said, You're Bill Hefner? I've been wanting to meet you all my life. You're a wonderful Congressman. I've even sent you a little bit of money, and I love the way you sing. You're the best singer ever.

He never once recognized that the President of the United States was also in the room. It was all about Bill Hefner. Bill Hefner's favorite song was "If I Can Help Someone."

Mr. Hefner, Shelly, Stacey, and Nancy, please know that you have helped many people. Thank you so much, and God bless Bill Hefner.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE RULE OF LAW AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MARKEY of Colorado). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for recognizing me for this hour.

For many weeks now, I've been coming to the floor with my colleagues to talk about something that, I think, is the glue that holds our Republic together, and that is the fact that the rule of law does and should prevail in this Nation. By "the rule of law," it means that we are able, as a people, to establish a set of rules. Whether they be legal rules, whether they be ethical rules, whether they be rules of this House or rules of this Nation, we agree to abide by those rules, and those rules cover every element of our lives. There is the rule of contract. We don't violate criminal laws. We have laws that govern this House. We have rules that govern this House, and they're the glue that holds a society together.

When we see the society having people or events that cause the glue to weaken, I think it's our duty and our responsibility as Members of this House to step up and say, hey, this is out of control; this has got to stop; the rule of law has to prevail. We have rules. We have responsibilities to keep those rules, and we as a Congress should hold each other to those rules.

The Congress of the United States, like many other bodies in this country, has a set of rules, and we police ourselves up. We're not the only group of people who does this. The medical associations do it. The bar associations do it. They have, within their own memberships, committees that police up the activities of their own members. The whole purpose is so that they can correct issues before they get out of hand and, if something is out of hand, so that they can have the strength of their convictions of their associations to stand for what is right even if it's difficult and to do the right thing even if it's difficult.

I've been raising issues on the floor of this House with the help of my colleagues now for about 10 weeks. Of these issues, there is one in particular with which I've had some amount of fun. Actually, I've created what's called the Rangel Rule to put a spotlight on some issues that involve the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; but over this August break, after talking about all of the things that were not resolved by our present Ethics Committee concerning Chairman RANGEL, more things have arisen which raise the issues to such a level that they just absolutely cannot be ignored anymore.

We have an Ethics Committee, and the American people should demand that, if we are going to set up a system where we police up this House, then we need to get behind the business of policing up this House. If it has to do with a Member who, by his own admission, has either through error or intent broken the rules of this House, then the Ethics Committee should not be deadlocked on political lines but should resolve this issue. If it's not going to be done, then the leadership of this House should take control of this House. The Speaker of the House was given the authority to be in charge of this House of Representatives, and it's her job. It's the job she signed onto. It's the responsibility she took to make sure that this House runs by certain rules. When blatant issues come forward and when newspapers across this Nation are crying out that some kind of justice needs to be done on an issue, if we're not going to do it, we're failing the very foundation of our Republic.

Tonight, I am joined by my colleagues—and there may be many of them here tonight—and we're going to talk about some of these issues that involve our friend. I want to say that specifically. I have no personal animosity whatsoever against Mr. RANGEL. In

fact, I will tell you he has been nothing but kind to me since I've been in this House, and I've tried to be kind back, but there is an issue that needs to be resolved, and it should not be resolved just by saying on the floor of this House "I'm sorry." It should be resolved by following the rules established by this House, and that's what this is all about. It is not personally aimed at anyone. It is about this institution and about the fact that the American people are more and more distrusting of this Congress for reasons just like the reason we're talking about tonight. They see things that upset them and that would upset them in their workplaces if they were to have that happen, so they ask: Why aren't the people we sent to Washington resolving this issue? What is wrong with those people? Now we need to ask those questions of ourselves. So I want to make it clear that this is not personal. This is about the rule of law and about the responsibility of this House.

I am joined by my good friend VIRGINIA FOXX, who is going to talk to us. She is from North Carolina. She is going to talk to us a little bit tonight. I yield her as much time as she may consume.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Texas for having begun this dialogue and this talk tonight about the rule of law.

I often say when I'm speaking to groups, particularly of young people, that what has made our country so great are several things, but underlying all of those is the rule of law. I think the three most outstanding are the rule of law, our Judeo-Christian heritage, and our capitalistic society—our economic system. We couldn't have our ability to worship God as we please and our capitalistic economic system if it weren't for the rule of law undergirding those.

When you look at other countries in this world, at other countries in this hemisphere, you will see that Mexico, for example, has been in the news a lot lately. They have many, many natural resources, as we do here, but what has created the problems for Mexico is that it is such a corrupt system. They do not operate by the rule of law. Most Americans just accept what we have in this country as something that exists everywhere. It doesn't. If we allow the rule of law to be torn down, then we really undermine our entire country and our entire culture.

I want to tell a little story, because I agree with Congressman CARTER on everything that he has said tonight. None of this is personal. This is all about the very strong and positive feelings that all of us have for the House of Representatives and for our government.

□ 2130

And I may get choked up in telling this story, but it was a great thing that happened today, because it allows me

to explain to people why I feel so strongly about what has happened.

I was on my way over here this afternoon a little after 6 o'clock to vote, and I was coming a little bit early, because I like to watch the news at 6 o'clock, and I was coming a little early so I could get in between commercials and watch a little bit more of the news before we had to come in to vote.

But as I was coming up the steps towards the Capitol, I noticed this couple, I don't know their age, I would say middle-age couple, since I don't want to guess people's ages. And I noticed that the woman spoke to one of our great security guys out there. And then I saw her walk up to the Capitol Building, up on the steps, and touch the building and then walk away.

And I could tell that she had asked permission to do that. And so I walked over to her husband and I said to her, Would you all like to go inside the Capitol? And she got very emotional, and she said, Well, you know, we have never been to Washington before. This is our first time here. And she said, All I thought that I had the hope of doing was touching the outside of the building. She said, I just, I don't have the words to express what a thrill it would be to go inside the building.

I asked them if I could use their names, it was Gary and Vicki Klassen from Oregon. And so they said, yes, they would like to come in. And so I brought them up, brought them up into the Members gallery and explained a little bit about the gallery here and told them that we were about to vote. And I explained some things to them and answered their questions and told them that between the first and second vote I would come back and answer the rest of their questions.

And they just kept on exclaiming, We are so thrilled to be in this building. We are in such awe of the building. We are in such awe of our government.

And, you know, I thought, we need more people like that in our country. We need more people who feel in awe of our government. We need people who get a thrill out of walking inside the Capitol.

After voting, I gave them a little bit more of a tour, and they just stayed that way. They were so grateful to me.

But I was grateful to them because when we meet people like that, we need to cherish that because these are folks who understand what this country is all about, and they feel an awe toward their government.

And I don't want people to stop feeling that way. And if we as Members of Congress don't uphold the highest standards amongst ourselves, then the majority of the people will stop feeling that way about our country, and we will lose our country.

You know, Mr. Franklin was asked when they signed the Constitution, What kind of country have you given us, and what kind of government have you given us? And he said, A Republic, if you can keep it. Well, if we are going

to maintain our Republic, if we are going to maintain what's good about this country and we are going to maintain the rule of law, then we cannot have a double standard.

I agree with the President in his comment: we cannot have two sets of standards, one for powerful people and one for ordinary folks.

It is bad policy to have different rules for Members of Congress than for the rest of the public. And I have told the people I represent, I will never, ever vote for anything knowingly giving a different set of rules for people in Congress than we have for everybody else. We shouldn't have a double standard. And I am very concerned.

I also point out to people when we come into this room, the ancient law givers whose faces are in profile around the top of the Chamber here, I know C-SPAN doesn't show them. But what I point out to them they are all in profile except one, and that's the one over the center door, and that's Moses looking down on us.

When Moses brought us the Ten Commandments, they weren't divided into A and B. They weren't divided into saying, you know, some people shalt not but others may because they have power. All of those 10 commandments apply to all of us.

And it's very important that we make sure that we pay attention to the fact that Moses is looking down on us every day and that we have a responsibility to the people of this country to live by the laws that have been set for everyone in this country.

And like my colleague from Texas, I have personally a good relationship with Mr. RANGEL, as far as I know. He is a very affable person, always smiling or almost always smiling, always jovial. So this is nothing to do with him personally. It is that the Congress and the House of Representatives in particular must abide by our own laws.

And if we establish laws that say, particularly here, that we have to report our income, that we have to report our assets, it is not right for some Members to leave things out and other Members to report everything. We must uphold the rules and the laws.

And so I want to commend again my colleague from Texas for putting together this Special Order tonight. And I know that there are others here who will add to the discussion that we are having.

Mr. CARTER. We have a poster here that has a picture of our President. And as the gentlelady just pointed out, he points out, I campaigned on changing Washington and bottom-up politics. I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards, one for powerful people and one for ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes.

I think that's a commendable statement by the President of the United States. And the issue we are talking about here today is an issue that in-

volves what some would argue is the most powerful chairmanship in the House of Representatives, and that is the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee.

I have a brief exhibit that we can talk about of some of the allegations that concern Mr. RANGEL: underreporting income and assets in 2007 by more than half, including failure to report income from his Caribbean resort property again. And those who have been listening will recall this all started because the chairman got up here on the floor of the House and told us that he had failed to report rental incomes for certain years on his Caribbean property.

And he said, But I paid the taxes. And if they assess any penalties and interest, I will pay the penalties and interest.

And it seemed to me very curious that after a long time of not—this is an income tax situation—and after a long time of not paying income tax on income, that no penalties and interest were assessed. And so I came up with the idea of the Rangel Rule, which said that if the chairman of the Ways and Means can be excused of his penalties and interest for failing to pay his taxes, then any other American who fails to pay theirs and goes in and pays those taxes and catches up can exercise the Rangel Rule and have the penalties and interests waived.

I did that to point out what the President of the United States said he did not want to happen in this country: people of power are getting special treatment over ordinary folks.

And so the purpose of it was to point out, it looked like to me that's what was going on here. So that's happened again, underreporting of income and assets by Rangel aides.

Not only did the chairman not report these things, but people he is responsible for didn't report them. Lease of a—multi rent-controlled apartments in Harlem, a special lease. RANGEL's use of a House parking spot for long-term storage of his Mercedes. Failure to report and pay taxes on rental income on his resort villa in the Dominican Republic. Alleged quid pro quo trading legislative action in exchange for donations to a center named for RANGEL at the City College of New York, and a gift rule violation on a trip to a Caribbean resort by the Carib News Foundation in 2007 and 2008. These are a list of some of the allegations that are going on.

And there is more. There is more to be discussed.

I am joined by many of my colleagues, and I am glad to see my friend LYNN WESTMORELAND from Georgia is here with us. I yield to my friend, Mr. WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend from Texas in the spirit that you are doing this. And I think you are doing this in the right spirit, that it is nothing personal against anybody. All we are saying is

that we feel like what the President said back in February of this year should be lived up to by the Members of his party that are in control of this House.

It is interesting that you brought up the Caribbean trip and the fact that the chairman of the investigation of this Caribbean trip to my friend from Texas was a participant in one of these Caribbean trips. That seems to be a little bit of a conflict of interest in itself.

And then, as you mentioned, some of these are in the hands of the House Ethics Committee; they are being investigated. But Mr. RANGEL has given political contributions to three of the five Democrats that are on this panel that are investigating him.

And so there seems to be some conflict of interest. And as the gentleman stated and my friend from North Carolina stated, I think the American people want to be free from any sort of insinuation that there could be some corruption, not only from his filings or his reporting of his assets and liabilities as we are required by the House rules, but in this investigation.

And I think it's very interesting that, and I am sure the gentleman from Texas will get into it later, but I would like to bring up that under H.R. 3200, when this bill, the health care bill, went through Mr. RANGEL's committee, the Ways and Means Committee, who was looking for revenue to pay for this, that it was interesting that they came up with some new tax laws that would actually punish those who failed to alert the IRS to potentially questionable tax exemptions, those people who are willing to come clean and kind of tell them yourself if they find out that something has been in error, bar the IRS from waiving penalties against taxpayers who clearly erred in good faith.

And I think this goes back to what my friend from Texas was talking about and the fact that Mr. RANGEL has acknowledged that this was a mistake, and that he paid his taxes, but there was no penalty and interest. Yet, it seems unbelievable that in this legislation that came out of his committee that he wants to almost double the fines in those instances.

In fact, one provision of the measure would double the fine against the taxpayer from 20 percent of the underpayment to 40 percent. And this goes back to what the President's statement said, you know, we don't need to have one set of standards for those people who are powerful. And nobody can deny the power of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in this House versus that of the ordinary person, the guy that works every day and is paying his taxes and that may have made some type of mistake. We all make mistakes.

That brings us back to the House rules. And we are talking about being a country of laws. And this body certainly should live by the laws that it sets for itself in the reporting.

And I am sure that many of us in here have had to amend these things or think of something and will amend it. But when you amend it for twice of what it was of things that you forgot, and there is a whole list of the things that Chairman RANGEL said that he had just forgot to list, but some of those were pretty eye-opening things that he had forgotten.

And it not only goes to him, but his staff that help him write legislation. And certainly one of them, I think, is his legal staff, one is his chief, that have gone back and actually filed amendments back since 2002. And so I think that just under the cloud of this suspicion, that the right thing for Chairman RANGEL to do would be to step down until this investigation is complete. And I don't think that's too much to ask.

And there is a lady that writes for the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that I have not agreed with a lot. But in this case, I do agree with her. Her name is Cynthia Tucker.

□ 2145

I would like to read for the RECORD the comment that she made on September 4 of this year.

"Rangel ought to do the honorable thing and step down. Just last week, he amended financial disclosure forms to report hundreds of thousands of dollars in income he earned between 2002 and 2006. He forgot a Merrill Lynch account valued between \$250,000 and \$500,000."

I don't know about my friend from Texas, but if I had that much money, I don't know that I would forget about it.

"He neglected to mention tens of thousands in rent from a New York brownstone he once owned, and his ownership of tens of thousands of dollars in municipal bonds also slipped his mind."

This comes from a very liberal writer for the AJC, and there are many more from the Buffalo News, the Washington Post and so on and so on, of people that see this for what it is and the fact that under this cloud of suspicion, the right thing for the chairman to do would be to step aside until the air can be cleared and this investigation can be completed.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Texas for bringing this up and the spirit in which he is bringing it up. I have had a lot of constituents ask me if they could claim the "Rangel rule" on their tax.

So my friend from Texas has certainly got that message out. We don't know what the outcome of this will be, but I think the eyes of this country are on this one particular interest, to see how we handle it and how we handle ourselves.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. I want to point out the timeline so everyone has a clear picture.

It was almost a year ago when the chairman took this floor and told us

about the first event where he had failed to pay taxes on rental income. He said he inadvertently did it. He didn't realize how he had it structured, that he was actually getting income from it, and that he was paying the taxes and that he did not expect any penalties and interest to be assessed.

Now, that was a year ago. What the gentleman from Georgia was just describing was a provision that was placed in this health care bill that we are debating today and we are going to hear from the President of the United States on tomorrow, and we have been discussing for the entire August recess. We have been discussing this in town hall meetings across this country. I did 10, one of which was a TEA party.

Thousands of people showed up to talk about this, and they are talking about this bill. And I think that is what really should upset you is to realize that when the chairman did not have penalties and interest assessed against him in his misfiling, he is putting a provision in the law that they, the Democrats, are trying to pass through Congress right now which would mean the ordinary person would pay double penalties and interest for failing to alert the IRS of potential questionable tax exemptions and that would bar the IRS from waiving penalties. They wouldn't be able to waive penalties, like they did for Chairman RANGEL.

By his own provision in the bill that he placed in there, there would be double fines under certain circumstances. I don't know what those circumstances are, but obviously if this keeps going on and on and on and on in the chairman's life, at some point in time it would seem to me that someone would say this is getting blatant. And yet the American people will have double fines, and we are seeing the chairman having no penalties and no interest being assessed against him.

That is what we are talking about. That is what the President of the United States said. That is what he wanted for the American people, is that ordinary people and people who have positions of influence in this country should be treated exactly the same under the law.

That is what the rule of law is all about. We establish rules, and those rules will be for everybody and there will be no exception for the prince nor the pauper. That is the way it is supposed to be. This prince of the House has actually written new rules into this bill. Another reason not to vote for this bill, as far as I am concerned, is because it doesn't treat the American people as fairly, if this is fair, as he got treated.

So when we are talking about the rule of law, we are trying to tell you that this cement binds us together as a people.

One of my good friends is here from the State of Georgia, another great Georgian—you know, the one thing is Georgians will answer the call, they

are always there—is my friend PHIL GINGREY, a physician from the great State of Georgia, one of my classmates and personal friends. I yield to him on this issue.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. It pains me in a way to be on the floor tonight to join with Representative CARTER and Representative WESTMORELAND, my colleague from Georgia who just spoke, and Representative VIRGINIA FOXX, a great Member on our side of the aisle from North Carolina, and the gentleman from Texas, another gentleman from Texas, another judge from Texas, which we will be hearing from in a few minutes.

But as painful as it is, Madam Speaker, to discuss a subject of this manner and this magnitude, I think it is important that we do it. I think it is important that we have the courage to do it, because I think the American people are watching what we do.

I think that this recent district work period, the month of August, the traditional time when Members are back in the district meeting with their constituents holding these town hall meetings, and this is something that didn't just happen this August, by the way, Madam Speaker, it has been a tradition probably, I don't know, for 100 years. People this year though, while we might typically have 25 or 50 or on a really good day 75 people, it was 500 and 1,000 and 1,500 and it was unbelievable how engaged the American people are now, who want desperately to be heard.

Madam Speaker, this business of “being out of control” and “being a gang” and “being a mob,” no, no. They are patriots, is what they are, Madam Speaker. They are mostly seniors who are worried about losing their coverage under Medicare.

When they hear, particularly if they are on Medicare Advantage, that that program is going to be cut about 17 percent per year over the next 10 years, I think \$170 billion taken out of that one program, where 20 percent of seniors, by the way, like that so much that that is what they choose to receive their health care is Medicare Advantage and not Medicare fee-for-service.

So the point I am making is people are outraged. They are so frustrated that powerful Members of Congress are not listening to them. And it is not always their Member, but it is the leadership. It is the committee chairs that have control over significant pieces of legislation, such as the America's Affordable Health Choices Act of 2009, H.R. 3200.

They know that Mr. WAXMAN is chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, where most of the bill was written. They know that Representative CHARLES RANGEL from New York, a long-serving Member since 1971, chairs the most powerful Ways and Means Committee. They know that

George Miller, the gentleman from California, a long-serving senior Member, chairs the Education and Labor Committee. So they are very frustrated and want to be heard.

So here we are talking tonight about grave concerns that we fellow Members have in regard to the ethical standards and behavior of people in this body who are in the highest positions. My goodness, the two most powerful standing committees of the House of Representatives are probably the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. On the one hand, the Appropriations Committee is charged with spending the \$3 trillion or so a year in the Federal budget, and the Ways and Means Committee, led by the chairman, is charged with raising the money to fund all these Federal Government programs.

People are getting a little concerned and upset with \$787 billion stimulus packages and deficit spending in the year 2009 of \$1.8 trillion, and a deficit that is calculated, not by me, not by my Republican colleagues, but by the Office of Management and Budget, which is the number cruncher, the Ph.D. economists hired by and who are part of the Obama administration, that says that over the next 10 years there is going to be \$9 trillion of deficit in the aggregate, that much more debt, \$20 trillion worth of debt at the end of the next 10 years. So people are very concerned about the integrity, the honesty and the fair play of these powerful Members.

Our colleague from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is so outstanding, and she was talking just a few minutes ago about the Old Testament and Moses and the commands, and she can turn a phrase better than I think most every Member in this body.

But, I was reading recently in the Old Testament in the Book of Deuteronomy, and Moses was saying to the Jewish people, look, God gave me these laws to give to you. These are not suggestions, these are commands, and you are not to add to them and you are not to take away from them. You are to follow them exactly as God has commanded and has given that command to me to give to you. Well, you know, that is pretty sacred stuff, the ultimate sacred stuff, I should say.

But here in the House of Representatives, the rules of behavior, the standards of official conduct, indeed, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, are pretty darn sacred too, Madam Speaker. And they are not suggestions. They are really there so that every Member is treated fairly, from the least to the greatest, from the freshman Member to the Member that has served 35 years and is chairing one of the most powerful committees in this House of Representatives.

So when we see things like this and what Representative CARTER has brought out in regard to these new findings of, oops, I just overlooked \$600,000 worth of income, it was a stock

account that I had forgotten about, well, you know, you don't forget about things like that. You don't forget about it.

To make sure, Madam Speaker, that everybody understands, when we have to fill out these financial disclosure reports on an annual basis as required by the standards of official conduct, my chief of staff will come to me and say, Congressman, we need to go through this 401(k), this IRA that you have had when you were working as a physician, and, of course, it is kind of frozen now because you are not continuing to put any money into it, but we have to look at every mutual fund and go through each one and see on each individual stock within a mutual fund, and you may have six or eight or ten different mutual funds in a 401(k) or an IRA, and my chief of staff says to me, Congressman, every stock in this, you have to list whether it gained money or lost money, whether something was bought or something was sold.

It is very time-consuming and rather painful, but it is for a good purpose, because the American people want to know, they want to be able to look in a very transparent way. They want to know who are the wealthiest Members of Congress, and they also want to know who are those who have absolutely no assets, no wealth other than their annual salary they receive from the taxpayer from this House of Representatives.

□ 2200

It's a point for a lot of people to try to understand that, to follow the dollar and see where maybe influences are applied and why people vote in the way—or if there's any suggestion that someone might cast their vote based on contributions or anything of that sort and that no one is in here enriching themselves at the expense of John Q. Public who is struggling every day just to maintain a job and to feed his family and support his children and hope that they get to go to college some day. And unfortunately, in this deep recession that we're in, some 6 million have lost their jobs over the last couple of years.

So this is a very, very serious issue that Judge CARTER, Madam Speaker, brings before us, and I think that the gentleman from New York who chairs this powerful committee should step aside while the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is doing its investigation.

Now, to his credit, he asked the committee to look into this over a year ago. But, Madam Speaker, I feel that he should have stepped aside at that point. But now here we are a year later and all of a sudden this additional “Oops, I forgot.” Well, you know, if he won't voluntarily do this, then I think it's the responsibility of the leadership, and ultimately the leadership of this body, Madam Speaker, as you know, is the Speaker whose seat you're sitting in right now as her designee this evening. And she will be there tomorrow night sitting right beside the

President of the Senate, the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, and of course we will be hearing from President Obama. We don't want this body, this House, this Chamber to be tainted.

And I think it's time for the gentleman from New York to be strong. Maybe he will be found to have not violated any ethical rules of this Chamber. We're not certainly putting him on trial here tonight, and I'm sure my colleagues would agree with that, but I think it's the right thing to do. I think it's courageous for Judge CARTER to bring this forward. And none of us are perfect, but every one of us needs to be honest with the American people and explain our actions or have others who are officially designated to do that look into it and let's get to the bottom of it.

With that, I will yield back to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend from Georgia, and reclaiming my time, I want to point out it's something that is part of this forum that we're discussing here today, because this is—I want to say something that's very important. This weekend, I had a couple of opportunities where I was interviewed by national news organizations on television. One of the questions that was asked of me was that at least there's been some inference that this is a racially motivated situation that I am in right here. And my statement—and I stick to this statement because it's the truth—this issue is not about race. This issue is about responsibility and meeting the responsibilities of this House. Mr. RANGEL needs to meet his responsibilities and, quite frankly, the Speaker of the House needs to meet her responsibilities.

I will refer you to the Buffalo News, "Rangel Should Resign," and it tells us what we've been talking about. And it says if he won't, Speaker NANCY PELOSI needs to push him.

Last year he tells us he had \$75,000 worth of unreported income. Now it gets worse. RANGEL failed to report at least half a million dollars in assets in 2007, and his net worth is about twice of what he claimed in 2008. The odds of simple error fall to near zero when it happens twice and when both times are in your financial favor.

This is PELOSI's sternest test. She should give RANGEL a week to do the right thing, and then if he doesn't, she must.

So this is about responsibility, and that's what we're talking about, being responsible to the rules of this House and to the rules of law. And there are two individuals here that have the opportunity to do what is right and be responsible, and that is the chairman and the Speaker.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield for just a second.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, I will.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. You've hit on a point I've got to address.

The President spoke to the American schoolchildren today, and I think the

President did a fine job. The speech, I know early on there may have been concerns about curriculum recommendations, that sort of thing, but I heard the Secretary of Education over the weekend, Secretary Arne Duncan, talk about this upcoming speech, and I couldn't agree more with what he said on Sunday morning; very logical, made sense to me. And the President, of course, gave a very powerful speech to America's schoolchildren and taught just what Judge CARTER just mentioned about personal responsibility and doing the right thing even when it's tough, even when it's hard to do that.

And golly, if our leaders in the highest positions of our country can't do that, how can we expect kids in the fifth grade to do it? How can I expect my 11-year-old twin granddaughters who are in the fourth grade—and I talk to them all the time about the personal responsibility of going a little beyond what's required, doing more, getting up earlier if you need to to do your homework, turn that television off at night or that video game. The President said the same thing, and I commend him for that.

But he's talking to all of us, Madam Speaker, about personal responsibility and doing the right thing.

You know, I don't know—and I will yield back quickly, Judge. But it may be that the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, wishes his boss, the Speaker of this House, would ask him to temporarily step aside while this investigation was ongoing. Maybe he doesn't want to do it himself. He's a World War II veteran, a Korean war veteran, in fact, a hero. I read part of his book. As has been mentioned here earlier, he's a very likable individual, without question. You can understand how he keeps getting reelected with such overwhelming majorities. But he may, as a soldier, as a hero, he may feel that, gosh, you know, I don't want to be the one to step aside, but I sure wish my boss would tell me to step aside.

So, as you point out, there are two people here that have a responsibility. And I'm glad you brought that up, because that's—I mean, you know, it was Harry Truman, a Democratic President, back in 1948 or so, who says, Hey the buck stops on my desk. Well, the buck stops on the Speaker of the House of Representatives' desk in regard to this issue.

I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to recognize my good friend and fellow judge, former judge LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas to speak and use as much time as he wishes to consume.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend, also the former judge from Texas, in pointing out some of the problems that are being created by the inaction. And I know this was touched on earlier, but this New York Post article, editorial dated September 2 of this year talking about some of the hy-

pocrisy here with this bill and provisions that were added coming out of the Ways and Means Committee, and I think it's important for people to understand also that Chairman RANGEL doesn't get to act by himself. The majority party that controls the Ways and Means Committee has authority to overrule the chairman. They've got enough members on their side to overrule the chairman and let him know there is a problem. There is a responsibility for the members of those committees. They're not supposed to be empty suits and dresses. They were elected by their constituents to come up here and do the right thing and not be hypocrites on any issue.

□ 2210

So I hope we won't have that experience.

When you look at some of the things this article points out, it says in the editorial, in fact, the provisions that were added to this health care bill increase fines, in some cases even for honest mistakes, this expert added, even punishing those who fail to alert the IRS to potentially questionable tax exemptions, bar the IRS from waiving penalties against taxpayers who clearly erred in good faith. The article goes on and talks about the provisions, it says here, that would prevent the IRS from waiving punishment in cases where tax officials thought the penalty was clearly excessive.

It also adds that under another provision, the IRS would require that taxpayers self-report areas where they may have gone over the line seeking tax advantages, and if they fail to self-report and problems are not found, the tax penalties would skyrocket. As this article says, the IRS becomes judge, jury and executioner. One provision says the measure doubles the fine against the taxpayer from 20 percent of the underpayment to 40 percent. So there is a problem here.

With regard to the issue of race, I cannot tell you how much I look forward to the day when there is not an application in this country that has a provision for race, because it doesn't matter. People don't care. We finally experienced the dream that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., talked about when we are judged by the content of our character and not by the color of the skin. That's the way it's supposed to be.

And in fact, I have got recently called a racist by information I was told by one reporter who called over the Posey bill that does something very simple, and I know there are people out there who are conservatives, maybe radicals, that think that there is some kind of conspiracy theory behind the President, that he is not really supposed to be President, that he is not qualified. Look, he is President. He is going to be President at least until another election.

But the Posey bill actually is implementing legislation that brings out the fact that the Constitution requires

these, and since The New York Times and The Washington Post pointed out a year and a half ago that they thought JOHN MCCAIN may not be qualified because he was born in the Panama Canal Zone that this legislation, it's just simply two or three pages that says anybody running for President beginning in 2012 will have to show that they're qualified.

It's not *ex post facto*. It doesn't do anything like that. It is implementing legislation. There are some judicial officials and experts that believe unless there is implementing legislation like this, even if everybody in the country knew that a candidate was born in Moscow, you still couldn't raise it because nobody would have standing unless we do some kind of implementing legislation. So the bill very simply just says that beginning in 2012 you have to show you're qualified.

Well, all of a sudden, I start getting calls. I even got mentioned in *Doonesbury* by name, and they're using the same language. One reporter says that she got it from a high source at the White House that I was trying to delegitimize the President and was trying to throw him out of office. When I recommended the reporter read the bill, and she did, we didn't have any more about it. But it concerns me.

I have also gotten all kinds of information. Apparently this information, supposedly some of it came from the White House, and they have now branded me a racist. And now I think it is appropriate to note, with my apologies to the Texas former Senator Phil Gramm, who I really appreciate his politics, I liked Alan Keyes better in 1996. I voted for Alan Keyes for President in 1996. And somebody has mentioned that he doesn't happen to be white. I didn't care. I liked his politics. Race didn't matter. But there are sources here in Washington trying to brand people racist when it has no application whatsoever. That is one example.

I will tell you another example is I came down here on the floor and raised the issue with the chairman of the budget over the Justice Department if since he recused himself 2 years ago over the budget process for the Justice Department if it wouldn't be appropriate to do that now. He said 2 years ago that he was recusing himself, would step aside and not handle the budget for the Justice Department while he was being investigated. Well, there's no indication that that investigation has ended. And yet this time there was no stepping aside.

My understanding was one reporter who asked for a comment from me said that they didn't think it was a big story like they did 2 years before when he did step aside because he had said, well, he wasn't actually going to preside over the FBI's budget, the people that were investigating. So it's okay to preside over the budget for the bosses of the FBI, the Justice Department, but not okay to supervise the FBI budget?

I mean, if we want to talk about the appearance of a problem, good grief, can you imagine anyone being a judge over a case and they are going to rule or preside over a case of somebody that gets to cut off their funds if they don't like what the judge does? It's just absurd. Anybody would look and go, there is an appearance of a problem here, and it destroys the reputation of this body.

Here again, it was the President who has continued to demand that Americans listen. And he has had town halls, listen to me, let me tell you, and he has had some listening sessions where they ship in people and it appears that some of them even have prepared questions to ask him that were given to them. It's not exactly listening to the people if you tell them what questions to ask.

In any event, we keep being told we have to listen because the President has a plan, and the bill that we have had, we discussed, because that's what's in front of us, we are told if you like your insurance you get to keep it. And yet page 16 of the bill that we are given says, if your insurance policy changes at all, any term or condition, you lose it. Then that doesn't seem to be all that honest of an approach, which to give the benefit of the doubt, apparently just means he didn't read it.

But now, the President wants to come in here and talk to us again because apparently we haven't been listening well enough, so he wanted to come speak. So he gets the invitation. He is going to come talk to us about health care.

Well, do you know what? There was another President that did the same thing on September 22 of 1993 because he didn't think that Americans were listening well enough about what he had to say about health care. So we had a joint session, and President Clinton told us, America, he told people in this room that they needed to listen and do what he was saying about health care reform. And so here we are, all these years later, and now we're going to have to listen again, September 9, it is actually 13 days short of where President Clinton was when he came and started telling people about it.

There is a problem when you don't listen to other people. And some of us have gotten an earful out there listening. I love to comment about one of my constituents when he says, look, he is telling us there are 45 million or 46 million people that don't have insurance, 15 percent of Americans don't have insurance, and so there is a problem. Well, you don't throw out the whole system to change that. In fact, one constituent said, look, when my ice maker broke, I didn't remodel the whole kitchen. And I think when you listen to Americans across the country, it's amazing the wisdom you get.

□ 2220

And I think it is a problem in this body when all we do is talk and we don't listen.

Well, I tell you, I know my friends, and Madam Speaker, that we've all gotten an earful over August, and I loved it. I enjoyed hearing what people had to say because they had given it a lot of thought. So this is what we need to do: Listen. And some great points have been made.

We need to preserve the appearance of propriety and protect against the appearance of impropriety, and that appearance is all over here. And some of the same people who are refusing to do anything about an appearance of impropriety are the same people we listened to my first 2 years rightfully talk about a problem when there is an appearance of impropriety. Well, it's high time they went back and listened to themselves 4 years ago and do what they said 4 years ago and quit ignoring the damage that's being done to this body when there is important business that needs to be done.

I would also encourage those same people who say that people on this side have no answers. If they would read a little bit, listen a little bit, they would find out there are all kinds of proposals. They are just so caught up in trying to fight against reform that would fix the appearance of impropriety that they're not actually doing the business this body ought to be doing. And with that, I yield back to my friend.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I would like to point out that as I've been talking about some of these issues, just so we can make it very clear, this is not just about Chairman RANGEL; I've also talked about JOHN MURTHA, AL MOLLOHAN, JIM MORAN, PETE VISCLOSKEY. All these are issues that are before the Ethics Committee or the Justice Department in some form or fashion. And so we are clearly saying we have appearances that are concerning us at every level.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be before the House once again.

As many Members of the House know, we've had an opportunity to go back not only to our districts, but to our States to deal with the issues in our districts and also talk to a number of our constituents. And I wanted to come before the House tonight with some of my colleagues to talk about one of the main issues that were discussed during the break. But as you know, when I come to the floor, I always like to bring to the attention of the House, so that we will never forget,

that we do have men and women in harm's way. As of September 8, 1:30 p.m. today, the total American military deaths in Iraq is 4,341, wounded in action returned back to duty is 17,623, and wounded in action and did not return to duty is 3,872. And I think it is very important to not only have that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but also for all of us here that are passing not only policy, but also appropriations, make sure that we remember the families and those individuals that continue to serve to allow us to salute under one flag. So as policymakers, we have to pay very close attention.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor tonight because I believe now more than ever, since I've been here for 7 years, that we need leadership not only in this House, but in the Congress in general, and that's including the Senate. And I think when we look at this issue of health care, there has been a lot said by many people, but there are only 535 some odd people in this country, including the President of the United States and members of his Cabinet, that are going to have to implement and provide this leadership on behalf of a country that needs people to man up and woman up and leader up and stop just saying, well, we shouldn't do anything about health care because every man and woman for themselves. Well, you know, that's not the American spirit. And it pushes against logic because when you look at rising health care costs, when you're looking at small business men and women that are having issues of being able to provide health care for themselves, leave alone the employees that they have, at affordable rates, when their employees are able to have health care that they can afford for their families, it's one thing to have health care, it is another thing to be able to afford it. And I brought a couple of personal testimonies from my State that I think it's important for people to pay very close attention to.

Now, tomorrow night we know that this Chamber will be filled with policymakers. We will have a number of the President's Cabinet here. And the President will walk down this center aisle just like other Presidents have done in the past. And Americans will definitely tune in, the world will tune in to see if we're willing to be able to do what we must do to be able to keep this country competitive. This is bigger than just ideology or a public plan, or no plan at all, or I'm going to score political points because it's an issue that is a landmark piece of legislation and only leaders can play in that room so I'm going to stand on our side and throw rocks at the building and break as much glass as I can and hopefully, hopefully I may confuse people enough to where when they're confused they will just say no, I don't necessarily think that we need to carry out this health care issue.

I want to know who's hiding and who's running around here in the dark

saying, oh, let's bring this thing up with health care. Hello. The whole 2008 election was based on health care. Some issues that some Members thought would come up—immigration reform, the war will play more of a substantial role, qualifications of how long you serve will play a major role—no, it was health care. And it was Democrats and Republicans and Independents and first-time voters that were voting for hope and just believing this time that something good will come out of their vote.

Now I'm going to tell you something. I'm from Florida. I'm from one of those States that over 3,600 Floridians lose their health care every week, every week. And it's kind of good for me to be here in Washington, D.C., along with my colleagues, all of them. And we all have health care, so there is no urgency on our side. There are no letters that are written by Members of Congress saying, oh, woe is my copayment; oh my goodness, the premiums have gone up, I can't afford it, I've been denied as a Member of Congress of an operation that I desperately need or a family member. That doesn't happen in our world; it doesn't happen in the House, it doesn't happen in the Senate, but it definitely happens in America and it definitely happens to Floridians that show up at town hall meetings. And I had some constituents saying, Kendrick, I would love to come to your town hall meeting, but I'm not into the whole bodily harm thing if I come. And that's something else that we have to pay attention to. So I think it's very, very important.

For those of us that came to Congress to make sure that our representation and our presence here is about representing people, people that are counting on us to do the right thing, people that are making sure that they don't find themselves in a situation to where that—well, I'm going to vote for my Member of Congress so he or she can have health care and I'll sit by and be a part of a debate over a public plan or a nonpublic plan. Hello. In the State of Florida you have 20 percent of the individuals that are under the age of 65 that are uninsured. Guess what, ladies and gentlemen. Eighty percent of us that have health care insurance are paying more every year because of the 20 percent. People want to talk about, well, you know, somebody has to do this and this is not guaranteed. Well, you know something? When you show up and you make that phone call, when you find out your child is sick or you find out that your husband now has to get that operation that you weren't able to detect every time you all had breakfast, but finally this kind of ache in his side or what have you has now become a situation that now you have to deal with and now you're spending \$3,000 of a copay that you don't have already, we can't prioritize it then and say, oh, I care about health care.

So I wanted to come tonight with my colleagues—and I see that they have

joined me—because I did talk with my neighboring colleague in Florida, Chairwoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, about the fact that we have to come back to the floor even though we have families, we have leadership positions in the House, we have major pieces of legislation moving through our committees, to come back here in the middle of the night like we did when we beat back the forces who wanted to privatize Social Security.

□ 2230

Think about it. Just think about it, Madam Speaker, if we'd listened to those voices when they had wanted to privatize Social Security. Hello again. Not only would the people over the age of 65 have had a lot to worry about, but there would have been a lot of young people who would have taken their money and put it out in this unregulated Wall Street and would have lost even their Social Security benefits.

So I'm here to tell you that I look forward to coming back to the floor with my colleagues to talk about this issue of health care. We know the President will come tomorrow and will, in his best effort, try to bring Republicans, Democrats and the two Independents, who serve in the Senate, together to bring about quality health care on behalf of all Americans.

When we talk about health care, I am talking about every person who lives in the United States of America. This will affect you. If you are insured, this will affect you, and it will affect you, hopefully, in a positive way because, every time you pay a premium, it's higher. Every time you pay a copay, it's higher. Folks are talking about the public plan issue, and I'll just close with this and then will yield to my colleagues.

I had a young lady call my office. I pick up the phone from time to time when it's ringing, and, you know, she was like, Well, Congressman, I just want to tell you that I'm against the public plan.

Okay. Well, tell me: What are you against? I want to know. You know, tell me a little bit about it.

I wasn't trying to be intimidating by, you know, going into sections and chapters.

Tell me.

Well, you know, I don't know if I want, you know, the government in the business of health care.

Well, that sounds like something that might have been said on the radio and not necessarily something that I felt that I failed her on because I didn't do what I was supposed to do as a Member of Congress and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in saying that, if there's another plan out there that will achieve bringing the private insurance companies' costs down, knowing that they're charging every last one of us with the monopoly that they have, then we will find ourselves in a better situation. But guess what? No one has a plan that will bring that cost down like a public plan will.

As I close, the U.S. Postal Service is a public plan, the last I checked. If the U.S. Postal Service went out of business tomorrow, do you think folks would be complaining? If you think they're complaining about the price of a stamp now, wait until you allow just the private sector to run by itself something that has broad application and that so many people have to deal with. See where that cost goes.

Medicare, the last time I checked, was a public plan for those over the age of 65. The public plan that we're talking about now is even far more conservative than that plan because, regardless of what your income may be or what it may not be, you're eligible for it. This public plan will be paid for with just premiums and not with taxpayer dollars.

Now, you know, I'm not one of these Members who says, Oh, my goodness. Without a public plan, I don't know if I can vote for this. I'm saying, if there's nothing else there—and I do mean nothing else there—that will bring down the cost of health care for everyday Floridians and Americans, then the public plan is the option to be able to deal with those issues and to be able to make sure that we make health care affordable.

Members of Congress, we don't have a problem. We have health care, and we will have health care, and we will not be denied an operation, and we will not wait in long lines. So I want to make sure that every American, regardless of your party affiliation and regardless of the fact if you've ever voted before in your life, pays attention to what I'm saying. It's not about those of us who are here. We're fine. It's about you and it's about your family.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. Thank you so much to my good friend and colleague, Mr. MEEK from Florida. It is great to be back here in the 30-Something Working Group.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We're pushing the "something" far.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We're pushing that "something" far—exactly—given that your birthday was the other day, mine is in 2 weeks and that we're a little bit past 30-something. I like to say that we're the "something" in "30-something," so I'm hanging my hat on that.

We have been reconvened by you, under your chairmanship of this working group, because yet again it is time to make sure that we can be clear and straight and direct with the American people. This is the season now of hard bargaining and of hard choices, and we have an opportunity for the first time in our lifetimes and in the lifetime of our generation to really, finally, achieve comprehensive health care reform.

What does that mean?

That is a term that has been thrown around for weeks and weeks now, and we've gotten to the point probably where most people's eyes glaze over or

where they turn the channel or where they, you know, just begin to tune out, but it's to their peril if people tune out to this debate and to this discussion, because we have the best opportunity for reform that we've had in American history. We have brought health care reform the furthest that it has ever been brought.

Five of six House and Senate committees have passed legislation reforming the health care system—to do what?—to ensure that never again will an insurance company be able to drop you or to deny you coverage based on a preexisting condition and to ensure that never again will your insurance and your health care be tied to your job instead of to you. We'll make that insurance coverage portable so that wherever you go and whatever decisions are made either to continue to employ you or if you move on to another job that health care will be attached to you.

Never again will we have to deal with health care-related bankruptcies or deaths as a result of not having health insurance, both of which happen now because people are facing catastrophic illness and because they don't have health insurance coverage. They have to wait until they're so sick that they have to use the most expensive ways of getting their health care treatment, whether it's the emergency room or because they are so sick that they have much more significant costs to their health care, and as a result, are bankrupted directly as a result of their health care problems.

There were 1,210 health care-related bankruptcies, Mr. MEEK, in my congressional district last year. I know we have the numbers for every congressional district; 1,210 individuals went bankrupt because of their health care problems. Families USA talked about how we had six health care-related deaths in Florida directly attributable to the fact that people did not have health insurance. How did they come to that conclusion? Because, if you don't have health insurance and if you have a basic health care problem, a simple health care problem, you can't afford to go to the doctor, so you get sicker and sicker until, one day, some folks just die because they become so sick that they can't get the problem taken care of, and then the problem overwhelms them even when they are able to access emergency care. So this directly attributes death to the lack of health care coverage. In 2009 in America, that is just unconscionable.

Over the last few weeks, I have spent a lot of time in my district going around and speaking to small business owners and individuals who either have preexisting conditions or who face astronomically high health care insurance premiums. They're frustrated. They say it's long past time that we get a handle on these costs; but what is the response on the other side?

You know, there are a lot of folks who are friends of ours on the other

side of the aisle who are saying that they're for reform, that they support health care reform—and this is the nice version—but that they just don't like the direction that we're taking it. They don't want socialized medicine. They don't want the government takeover of health care or the government to get in between you and your doctor.

Let me read you this passage, my colleagues, and just see what you think about this expression of sentiment. This is a voice on a record, urging listeners to write their Members of Congress and to ask them to oppose this legislation:

"And, if you don't do this and if I don't do it, one of these days, you and I are going to spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in America when men were free."

Now, does that sound familiar? It does sound familiar because it sounds like what our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing to scare people, particularly senior citizens, into believing that somehow they're going to be giving up their freedom if we pass health care reform. Well, actually, that was Ronald Reagan back in 1961 when he was trying to scare seniors and scare doctors and scare Americans into believing that somehow Medicare was going to be the end of the health care system and of health care coverage as they knew it.

□ 2240

And now it would be to any of our peril if we went home and suggested that people be separated from their Medicare, because it's been one of the most successful health care programs in American history covering seniors who would have certainly died if not for having that health care coverage. And we have got to make sure that we have this discussion in this debate in a responsible manner.

We are not going to get in between you and your doctor, Americans and their doctor. On the contrary, we want to make sure that the people who are between you and your doctor, which are the insurance company bureaucrats, who are looking more at the bottom line than they are at making sure you stay healthy, that they are moved aside and we can have health care reform and health care coverage that ensures that people stay healthy, that they can get the access to health care that they and their health care provider decide is appropriate, that we bring down the cost of that health care and that we make sure that we force, especially in some of the communities—not that you and I represent, because the three of us represent fairly urban areas, but in the places in this country where there is maybe one or two private plans and very little competition.

So they can charge whatever they want. They can include whatever they want in those policies, that side by side, with the private plans, is a public

option that keeps those private plans honest, that forces them to be more innovative, forces them, in order to hold on to those customers, to provide coverage that's more comprehensive and more affordable.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentlewoman and I thank Representative MEEK for convening here tonight.

Here is how I look at the issue of the public option. First of all, I think it has gotten a lot more attention in the debate than it takes up in the bill. There are a lot of very important pieces to this health care reform bill, and public option is one of them; but I look at it this way: I have faith in my constituents. I think that if we give them choice, they are going to make the right choice for themselves and for their families.

And just like in countries in Europe, where you may only have one choice, you have got to buy, take public insurance, in this country we also have only one choice as well: you have to take private insurance.

And this notion that we shouldn't give our constituents the choice, up to them, as to whether they want to stay on their private plan or for a variety of reasons, they think it might be better to be on a publicly offered plan, I think that shows a lack of faith in the American people.

And I think if it's good enough for every single Member of Congress, if it's good enough for every Federal employee and State employee in this country, if it's good enough for our veterans, if it's good enough for our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, and if it's good enough for every single individual in this country over 65, well then maybe our constituents should have a choice of whether it's good enough for them or not.

So to me it just comes down to choice, as was mentioned about the lack of choice that's out there right now. If you are working, odds are that you might have one choice, maybe two choices, maybe three choices. But you are lucky if you have that many.

If you live in a State like Connecticut, we have one insurer that covers over 50 percent of the people in our State. That's 50 percent of the States in this Nation where one insurer has over half the market, 70 percent of States in this country have two insurers that cover 70-75 percent of the market. There is not enough choice out there as it stands right now.

So I just have faith that my constituents are going to be able to make the right choice for themselves.

And for all those people that say, you know, well, the government can't run anything, but the public option is going to run private insurers out of business, those arguments don't work together, right. Because if the government can't run anything, then they are not going to be able to run an insurance plan, nobody is going to join. But it should be up to people whether they

do that. That's how you put competition back in a very, very broken marketplace.

And so to me, to me the one unifying theme that when I was home this August, as it has been throughout the entire time that I have been doing this job for the last 2½ years, that has united the people who support this specific proposal and the people that are undecided and the people who don't like it is cost.

I mean, everybody agrees that the system costs too much right now. I mean, over and over again, I hear the same story that you, Mr. MEEK, Mr. RYAN heard, business owners talking about a 20 percent increase last year in their health insurance premiums, individuals looking down the barrel in Connecticut of a 30 percent increase in our major insurance plan. Employees having seen wage increases be put off year after year after year because their employers are taking all the extra money they are making and putting it to health insurance premium increases.

And everybody understands that we need to tackle costs here. Well, guess what. The Congressional Budget Office, right, which Republicans and Democrats alike hate because they think it's too nonpartisan, that budget office, which we listened to, which guides our decisions here, says that the public option is going to save our health care system \$100 billion, \$100 billion because it's going to offer something cheaper to people and it's going to put pressure on the private insurers to bring their costs down.

So if we really care about costs, and this has to be part of the discussion, there is a lot of other things we can do here. We will talk about the insurance exchange which is going to force insurance companies to compete against each other, the tax credits we are going to give to businesses to try to have them offer insurance to their employees. But when all is said and done, we should be keeping every possible tool in the tool box that can bring the costs down. That's one of the things amongst many that can unite us in this building, in this Chamber and throughout this country.

And I think if there is one thing that I found when I was home, it is that when you really got down beyond some of the shouting, beyond the rhetoric, beyond the talking points that both sides were handing out, that there was actually a lot more that united us here.

And I think our job here, as we hit that witching hour on this bill, is to distill that down to something we can all be proud of when we go home.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate it. One of the things—we have got a little old school thing going here too that I ought to mention. But one of the things that I think is very important that everyone I talked to in August, Canfield Fair, St. Mathias, Slovak Festival, Irish plans, Italian-American Festival, every single time people were

understanding the fact that they are paying for all of these uninsured people right now.

They get it. They know this \$1,800 a year increase they are going to get next year is because there are going to be another 50 million people going to the emergency rooms. Doesn't make any sense. But I think one of the things too that we need to remember when we were talking to seniors about Medicare is that we have this population, especially, I think, in the industrial Midwest where people are 55, 60 years old, have lost their jobs, lost their insurance. Maybe they are still working, but the insurance company or their employer is not going to pay for their insurance anymore.

We have a very unhealthy segment of our population going into the Medicare program. And so if you are living in northeast Ohio, and if you are 55 or 60 years old, you lose your health care, a lot of people are saying to themselves, I am going to wait until I get into Medicare to get my heart surgery. I am going to wait until I get into Medicare to get my hip surgery. Or I am going to wait until I get into Medicare for you name it.

And so from 60 to Medicare age, a lot of things go wrong that you probably could have managed better. So we have this very unhealthy population going into the Medicare program.

So what our seniors need to know because our friends on the other side who don't want any kind of health care reform at all are saying, well, they are going to cut Medicare. Well, it's nice to see a few Republicans stand up and actually have some concern about Medicare because Newt Gingrich and Grover Norquist and these guys are talking about letting it wither on the vine and those kinds of things.

But it's going to save Medicare money if we have this 50-, 55-, 60-year-old population getting the kind of preventive, manageable care so that they don't all of a sudden say, I am going to wait until I get into Medicare. And then you go into Medicare and you need something that costs hundreds of thousands of dollars more. That's what is hurting our Medicare system more. So we need to bring some of those costs down.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Just to continue your point to its next logical step, shifting this health care system from a sick care system to what it is now, to a prevention and wellness-based system, ensuring that people can get their health care needs and their checkups taken care of before they get sick, is going to prevent those catastrophic, maybe not completely preventable catastrophic illness, but stave off chronic and catastrophic illness so that the actual health care that people go and get is less expensive health care, is preventive-based health care, and we will have a generally healthier population.

□ 2250

I will add to that the description that you provided of 60- to 65-year-olds.

There are many people in that category, and you can extend it actually down to about age 50, people who are sort of past their quality working years and should be retiring, maybe continuing to work and wearing themselves down. It is going to actually make them more sick, but because they have preexisting conditions and they are not yet Medicare-eligible and the only insurance many of them have is tied to their job, they are anchored to those jobs.

My own mom is one of those individuals. She has a preexisting condition and she gets her insurance coverage through her work. She is 63 years old and is not Medicare-eligible yet, so she has to continue to work full time in order to keep the coverage. There are countless stories like that in America. And she is the mother of a Member of Congress.

Just to show you, people are bawling about how privileged we are and our families. We have good coverage, decent coverage, but basic coverage, and our family members are just like any other family members across America. We all can list out countless examples of people who would benefit from comprehensive health care coverage.

Before I yield back to the gentleman, I want to go back to our friends on the other side of the aisle, because it has been frustrating to me as I have debated, and I am sure each of you has debated colleagues of ours on the other side of the aisle on this subject over the last few weeks, to hear them say that they are for reform, because, quite frankly, I just don't think that passes the smell test.

They were in charge here for 12 years. The last eight, they were in charge of everything. They had the opportunity. The ball was in their court. They certainly could have taken the ball and run with it. But health care reform was not a priority for them. It never has been, and it isn't now.

It is disingenuous for them to suggest that they are for reform, but not the reform that we are proposing. If they were for reform, they could have gotten it done. The reform that they offered the American people was some lame prescription drug part D program for Medicare that left a giant doughnut hole that thousands and thousands, tens of thousands of senior citizens are falling into that our health care reform proposal would fill and make sure that people wouldn't have to decide not to stop taking their medicine once they fall into it, and be able to again focus on getting people well and keeping them well instead of spiraling ever downward into a more sickly state.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Let me just add to that, that for all of the talk we have heard on this floor from our Republican friends about fiscal responsibility with respect to health care and respect to the overall budget, when that bill came up for debate, when they made their one foray into health care,

a bill written for the drug industry and the insurance industry which have made record profits off of this program and many others, they didn't pay for a dime of it. They borrowed every cent in order to fund that Medicare prescription drug benefit.

You want to talk about the things that added to the deficit that Barack Obama inherited? Right at the top of that list is the only major effort that the Republican House and the Republican Senate made to health care.

So not only when they constructed the Medicare benefit did they get it wrong, but for all of their talk about making sure that this health care bill is deficit neutral, which is a commitment, a commitment from this President and from the House and from the Senate, when they had the opportunity to do it, they borrowed every single dime to do health care.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It may sound good to say if we just fix this or fix that, fix this and fix that, we will be okay. The problem we have now is we have this patchwork system that we just have been constantly patching up, and it is not addressing one of the main problems, and that is we have got all of these uninsured people. Some people say it is 10 million, some people say 15 million, so it is probably somewhere in between.

But the bottom line is, Mr. MEEK, all these people are going to the emergency room. That makes no sense to anybody. So you go in with your insurance card, you are paying for the person who is walking in there. What we are asking people to do in this reform package is for people who are now using the emergency room as their primary care doctor, that they will have to pay something now. They will have skin in the game. They will have a copay, they will have a premium. You are going to get something out of them.

That is how we are going to help build this new system, is by having people who are now getting something for nothing will have to pay and have skin in the game and take money out of their own pocket, Mr. MEEK, and pay for their health care, and that will help everybody.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. RYAN, it is just so good to see Mr. MURPHY and you and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ here back on the floor again, and the fact that some of the arguments that you hear, that I don't think we are here for some big, let's-build-the-government-even-more, you know, that the reason why we are here is to make sure that the government gets bigger and more control, that that is what we ran for.

No. We are here because we care about the people that sent us here. I said it earlier when I was here on the floor, just me at the top of this hour, when I said, you know something? No one came up to me and said, Congressman, I woke up at 7 a.m. in the morning voting for representation. I am so

happy to send you, your wife and your two kids to Washington so you can have health care that I will never have. Okay?

The bottom line is I am sitting here, I am going to put these testimonials on my web site that some people have emailed to me and some I got from my town hall meeting.

I am looking at Robert here from Wellington, Florida. He says as a self-employed person, I am not eligible for any group coverage. Therefore, I must pay \$4,000 a year for my family of four, and I have deductibles totaling up to \$7,000 out-of-pocket before anything gets covered, in his plan that he has now.

In this current economy, my income has been greatly reduced, but I cannot change for a less expensive plan until the open enrollment period comes around, and that is almost a year away. It is nuts.

He says, in a nutshell, health care could well bankrupt me, even without a medical catastrophic event taking place, and I am trying to figure out what will the new Congress and the President do for me. That was his email to me as a Congressman.

Now, I am not his Congressman, but he is just reaching out to Members of Congress. And the bottom line is there are real people out there that are dealing with it.

Mr. RYAN, you make so much sense when you say folks walk through—I know that is kind of hard for you to believe, me saying that—walk through the doors of an emergency room getting care, and you are watching these public hospitals going under. Think about it. They are reducing staff.

I was in Daytona the other day at a Labor Day picnic. A lady came up to me and said, Congressman, this is my first time meeting you. I have a mother in a hospital, the public hospital there in Volusia County, and we have to take turns being in the room with her because of the staff cuts that are there.

This is all coming from uncompensated health care that is driving up the costs, not only for public hospitals and private hospitals, but also driving up the costs for us who pay premiums and copays and all of those things.

So I would say this also to my friends that live in rural communities. I heard you talk about Ohio, and, of course, we can all talk about our States. But I can tell you this: In rural communities right now in this bill we incentivize doctors to stay in those communities. They are communities that are in need and they don't have specialists there.

We also look at addressing the disparities as they relate to rural America. Right now we have individuals that have to drive for miles and miles and miles. That is not okay, especially when you are in need of care.

So when we look at this whole comprehensive piece, we are looking at something that is going to bring about better coverage for all Americans,

make sure that those of us that have insurance, that we bring our costs down, making sure that people who have preexisting or family conditions, God forbid this gentleman from Bradenton, if something was to happen, one of his family members, he discovered his daughter had some sort of illness to where that she has to go operation to operation, and then that insurance that he has, which is not as good as mine, runs out, he is on his own, by himself. And folks can't say well, that is his personal problem. No, that is going to be my problem too and it is going to be the individual's problem who has health care, because he or she is going to pay for the fact that he can't get coverage and he works and provides, he is a business person and he just wants to insure his family.

□ 2300

Mr. RYAN, I'm going to say this, and then I'm not going to say anything else during this hour, but we'll yield back when that time comes, 10 minutes after the hour.

I will tell you this: that those of us in this Chamber didn't know better, because all while I was listening to people throughout the State of Florida during the break, I couldn't help but—like a lady posed a question to me in a townhall meeting: Congressman, what are you going to do to bring about the kind of change we need in Washington, D.C.? Are you going to be on the fence? Are you going to say, Well, you know, I don't want to necessarily say anything, don't want to do anything? I'm going to run in the back of the Chamber, put my card in and run out the door. Or am I going to come here and fight for those individuals who sent me here to fight for them.

And those are businesspeople, and those are individuals, and those are people who are listening to us right now that have a health care crisis or have an imminent health care crisis coming and wondering if they're going to have insurance. I would much rather go down fighting for them than sitting here trying to be safe and trying to score political points and win a couple more seats in Congress because it will help my political ideology. We're beyond that right now.

We are dealing with the real deals that are crippling our multinational companies that are here, based here in the United States, to compete with other countries who have health care reform and have a policy to where that doesn't bankrupt big and small companies.

So I'm just asking my colleagues, be they either Democrat or Republican, be a man, be a woman, be a leader, come here to Washington, D.C., and speak fact and not fiction and make sure that we fight, because we're as close as we have ever been to doing this right now, DEBBIE, and I think it's important that if we're going to go down, we're going to go down fighting. And I tell you if I have anything to do with it, we're not

going down. That's one. Two, people are going to get health care. And in the final analysis, they're going to look at the leaders, either Democrat or Republican, and say, You know something? I'm glad they fought. They did not retreat.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, Mr. MEEK, I can't help in listening to you but think of this debate through my eyes as a mom. There's nothing more important to moms than making sure that your children stay healthy, and there's nothing that tears out a mother's heart worse than looking at your child, knowing they're sick and knowing that you can't do anything to make them well, and you would do anything to make your child well if you could.

Imagine layering on top of that angst for a mother the fact that she wasn't covered by health insurance nor were her children, and as a result, she couldn't even take her child to the doctor when they first got sick and she has to wait and wait and wait until her child gets sicker and sicker and sicker until she has to use the emergency room as her primary access point for health care for her child.

Now, for me, we are at the point in this country in our Nation's history where you should not be separated from our ability to provide for the health and well-being of your child due to the difference in your wealth.

When a child turns 5 years old in this county, Mr. MEEK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MURPHY, no parent has to worry about whether they're going to be able to pay for their children's education because we have education that's universal in America. It's a given. It was decided over 100 years ago. Everyone gets equal access to education and the government pays for it.

We're not even going that far here. What we're saying is health care should be a right and should not be a privilege.

Mr. RYAN, one of the things that just galls me, which is why I keep going back to it, is how disingenuous our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been.

Let me quote one of our colleagues, and I won't name her. She said this last week to a conservative organization, and this was reported in the newspaper. A colleague of ours, in talking about their views on health care reform said, "What we have to do today is make a covenant, to slit our wrists, be blood brothers on this thing. This will not pass. We will do whatever it takes to make sure this doesn't pass." And then she continued, "Right now, we are looking at reaching down the throat and ripping the guts out of freedom, and we may never be able to restore it if we don't man up and take this one on."

That is a direct quote from one of our colleagues who I won't name, but, Madam Speaker, I would like to enter this into the RECORD.

TALKING POINTS MEMO: 9/1

Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-MN) spoke yesterday to the right-wing Independence Institute, the Colorado Independent reports, and she called on conservative to really come together in the fight against President Obama on health care.

"What we have to do today is make a covenant, to slit our wrists, be blood brothers on this thing," said Bachmann. "This will not pass. We will do whatever it takes to make sure this doesn't pass."

The sanguinary rhetoric continued. "Right now, we are looking at reaching down the throat and ripping the guts out of freedom," she said. "And we may never be able to restore it if we don't man up and take this one on."

Bachmann also denounced a system under which some Americans pay half their income in taxes: "It's nothing more than slavery."

We don't even have to deal with transparency because it's clear that the stakes are so high for them. If I hadn't read it myself, I wouldn't have believed it. The stakes are so high here. They know that if we're successful at finally reforming the health care system and covering everyone, that politically next year they won't be able to be too successful in the elections. And that's what it's about for them, it's about power.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to say two things and then I will be done for the night, too.

There was this interesting article in Newsweek this week. It was about a book about William F. Buckley and about the battle between the extreme right wing of the Republican Party and the William F. Buckley National Review kind of wing, and there was this little battle post-New Deal.

But it's interesting to note that right after Roosevelt got in, there was this extreme reaction, very similar to what we're seeing where every critique of what Roosevelt was doing was socialism, communism, and all of these fancy names. But there were also these vigilante minutemen who would show up at these events carrying their guns, and it was amazing, because that's exactly what we're dealing with here.

There's no solution. There are just these critiques of how the train is moving down the track. The American people want to go in another direction.

But I wanted to share this story because I think this is what we're all talking about.

I ran into this woman at the Canfield Fair. I stood outside the Democratic Party tent. This is one of the biggest fairs in Ohio over Labor Day. I stood there for 4 hours, 4 hours, just south of Youngstown, Ohio. I had two people out of all the entire time come up to me and say, What are you doing with this socialist—and they're also against the energy bill, so it was totally the right wing talk radio crowd that was like inundating them with this stuff. Two people came up against this.

But what this one woman said, she's 35 years old, married, kid. Husband just lost a job. They made about \$58,000 a year when he worked. They now make \$32,000 a year. She is working. He, after

he lost his job, is going back to school. No income, trying to better their life. The daughter was in the stroller there.

This woman is telling me this story. She has a condition. She's got to take medication. It's very expensive. She can't afford it. Now they're paying out of pocket. She makes \$32,000 a year, down from \$58,000 because the husband lost the job. And she said, Do you want me to go on welfare and go on Medicaid? Because that's what I'm forced to do.

Now, if there's any value we respect here in America, it's somebody that wants to work. She wants to work. She wants to provide for her kids, her husband. She wants to have a nice family. She wants to have the dignity of work. And the system now is set up that that really may be the best decision for her and her family is to go on Medicaid and take welfare benefits. That's not what we want.

And what we're saying is why should this woman who's working her rear end off, her husband is going back to school to get retrained, those are the people we want to help. That's what this whole thing, the whole thousand pages that everyone keeps talking about, that's what this whole thing is about. It's about helping that woman, her husband, and that kid.

And that's why, DEBBIE, as you said, the stakes are high. KENDRICK, the stakes are high, and we need to pass this thing.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. If our friends on the other side of the aisle want to have a debate about freedom, let's have a debate about freedom.

Listen, we don't legislate on anecdote here. We legislate on data and statistics and evidence. But the anecdotes are powerful because they're representative of what the data tells us.

And I think about the woman in my district who raised her hand at an event I had at Town Green last week, and she said, Listen. I work for an employer who's downsizing and looking to cut costs wherever they can, and I've got a child with a very serious illness. She's on this employer's health care plan, and I know that I am targeted. I know that if they can get rid of me and get rid of the expenses associated with my daughter, they've just saved a lot of money. And I know if I lose this job, I'm not going to be able to find another one because there's no way that somebody is going to pick me up if they have to cover the cost of my daughter who has an illness through no fault of her own, no fault of mine.

What kind of freedom is that?

I think about the guy who raised his hand and told me the story about the fact that he had been working for a new company that had just hired him in New Britain, Connecticut, a couple of years ago. He had had a good, steady income for 2 years, but he got diagnosed with gallbladder cancer and he couldn't show up for work any longer, and they fired him. They fired him and he lost his health insurance.

□ 2310

Now he spends every single dime that he makes off of his unemployment checks to pay for cancer treatment. What kind of freedom is that? When we want to talk about freedom, health care reform, giving freedom to people who have insurance and want to keep it, giving freedom to people who lose it and need to get medical care, let's have a debate about freedom, because the proponents of reform are going to win that debate, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We have 30 seconds left.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just appreciate being together again and knowing that on a regular basis over the next several weeks and months we will be getting together to press for health care reform for everyone.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Absolutely. Madam Speaker, with that, from these Members that came before the House tonight, we want to definitely let other Members know that we will be coming to the floor. We will be sharing accurate information as we have done over the years, and we will continue to do it good or bad. We look forward to the President coming and addressing us tomorrow in a joint session.

With that, we yield back the balance of our time. Thank you.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker for the recognition. I almost feel like now that I have got equal time for a reply from the last 45-minute segment, I would remind my friends on the majority that they are in the majority. This is the House of Representatives of the United States. Any bill can pass on the floor of this House with 218 votes. As I recall the last numbers, we have 177 Members on the Republican side, you have 258 members on the Democratic side. That means you can pass pretty much whatever you want whenever you want as long as you keep only 40 Members of your party from straying, and you can only lose 40 Members from your side and you can pass whatever you want.

Now we read some articles in the paper today where there are 23 Democrats who say no way are they voting for this health care bill after they have been through the summer that they have had. Okay, you still have a comfortable margin of 20 votes to pass whatever bill you want. So, please, don't set this up as a straw man Republican versus Democratic argument. The Republican Party in the House of Representatives in this Congress cannot stop you from passing anything that you want to pass. We do not have the numbers. We do not have the organization. Some might argue we don't have

the leadership to block anything that you want to pass.

So your argument is an internal argument. It is Democrat versus Democrat. Bring the bill to the floor of the House that you want to bring. Bring it to the Rules Committee. You certainly have done it plenty of times. Bring it to the floor of the House. We will have our obligatory 2 hours of debate. We will have the vote, win the vote, and send it over to the Senate. You have 60 votes on the Senate side. This should not be a challenge for you. Send it down to the White House. You have a President who will sign virtually anything you send down to him.

This is not an argument that you are having with Republicans. This is an argument you are having internally within your own caucus. And why are you having that argument internally within your own caucus? Because you have not sold this proposal to the American people. And you felt that acutely during the August recess.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. BURGESS. Absolutely. I will refer to the Chair.

Madam Speaker, this is because the other side did not make the sale to the American people. They did not engage the American people from the bottom up, from the grass-roots up, which is the way you have to do tough legislative proposals, transformative legislative proposals. You don't start at the top and work down. That's the Soviet style of doing things, Madam Speaker. This is America. We go from the grass-roots up.

Our friends on the Democratic side chose not to do it that way. Instead, they would rather vilify Republicans because, after all, that's what helps them raise money and win votes. And after all, isn't it all about just winning votes and maintaining your majority? You're not really held to account by the American people as to whether or not you pass your agenda or not, apparently, if we are to believe the poll numbers.

But, Madam Speaker, I do not believe this can be done from the top down. I do believe this has to come from the grass-roots up. We saw a Member of Congress, a Democrat in one of the midwestern States, plaintively ask her audience on YouTube during the month of August during one of the August town halls, don't you trust me? And the response she got back from her audience was, well, apparently not. The audience didn't trust her.

All across this country, Members of Congress have heard the voices of August. The question is, the real question for this House is, was anyone listening to those voices as they were speaking to us?

Right now, this Congress has historic low credibility ratings. We have some of the lowest credibility ratings in the

last 26 years. Two years ago, 2½ years ago, when the Senate tried to pass massive immigration reform, they found because of the very low credibility levels that they had that no one trusted the United States Senate to pass this type of immigration reform. As a consequence, despite the backing of two very powerful Senators, one on the Republican side and one on the Democratic side, despite that very powerful backing, they were unable to pass sweeping immigration reform in 2007. The American people recoiled in horror when they saw what was happening, flooded the Senate switchboard, shut down the Senate servers, and the Senate got the message and very quickly went on to other things that might occupy their time for the rest of that summer.

Well, this summer has been no different. Switchboards have been shut down. Servers have been overwhelmed. The American people have weighed in on this issue, and it is overwhelmingly opposed to what the Speaker of the House has pushed through the three committees here on the House side.

Now, if we do not have the credibility to do a sweeping proposal, a sweeping legislative proposal such as has been before us, to essentially allow the government to claim one-seventh of the Nation's economy, if we don't have the credibility to do that, should we just do nothing? Or should we, in fact, try to achieve some deliverables for the American people? I think every one of us heard that the American people are interested in us effecting some reforms. We heard some of them mentioned just in the last hour on the Democratic side. There are things on which we do agree. There are things on which we can work. And there are deliverables we can accomplish for the American people.

But the fact of the matter is the American people do not trust us, do not trust us to undertake this type of sweeping reform and transform the way health care is delivered in this country such that many people may not even recognize it.

Now, I do take some exception to some of the comments that I heard in the last hour. I was a physician. For 25 years, I practiced medicine. There are plenty of times I got up in the middle of the night, and I knew that delivery I was going to do or that operation I was going to perform was something for which I would never be compensated. That's just part of the job. American physicians, men and women, show up all hours of the day and night to render this type of care, and they don't ask where the payment is coming from.

People get taken care of in this country in a timely and respectful manner, and it happens every day of the week. And quite honestly, I am very tired of hearing the type of rhetoric we just heard on this House floor where America's physicians are seemingly indifferent to the plights of people who hap-

pen to be ill and uninsured. Patients are taken care of all the time across this country in clinics, in hospitals and in emergency rooms by caring physicians, caring nurses and caring hospital staff without regard for that patient's ability to pay. It happens every day of the week.

It is so frustrating to hear people talk about the only way to pay for health care in this country is either through a private insurance or a government program. There is plenty of care that is just donated by the generosity of America's physicians, America's nurses and America's hospitals.

In fact, the only thing standing in the way of this sweeping health care reform that the President is going to come talk to us about tomorrow night is, again, an internal conflict on the Democratic side. If we had done this bill in July, as had been proposed, if, in fact, we had voted on this bill on July 31, which was what the chairman of the three committees desired, which is what the President at the White House desired, had we voted on this bill by the 31st of July, we would have gone home to face our town halls; but it would have been a different equation because the bill would have already been passed and would be off to the Senate. But we didn't do that.

A funny thing happened on the way to ramming this thing through, and many Members on the Democratic side began to hear from their constituents and began to hear that this was not perhaps such a good idea after all.

Do bear in mind, Madam Speaker, 218 votes are what are required to pass any bill out of the floor of this House under a rule. The Rules Committee is the Speaker's Committee. The Speaker has a 9-4 advantage in that committee. The Speaker could get any rule pushed through the Rules Committee that she wishes. She could bring any bill to the floor that she wishes. We have seen it time and time and time again; 218 votes are what is required.

□ 2320

Do not tell me, do not continue to perpetuate the fantasy that somehow 177 Republicans are able to prevent this bill from coming to the floor. And again, I would reiterate, you have the magic 60 votes in the Senate. You don't need reconciliation; you don't need a fancy procedural maneuver, you have the votes, 60 votes in the Senate, to pass whatever you care to pass. And of course you have a President who has already committed to signing this bill.

One of the things that I heard a lot back home was a concern about the cost. And this is something that is going to continue to come up and continue to be problematic for anyone who wants to undertake a bill that is as sweeping as the one that we had before our committees last month. The bill itself had very little in the way of cost containment contained within the bill. Oh, sure, there were some physician cuts—we always rely on those—there

were some cuts to home health care, there were some cuts to our radiologists and imaging, but in general there was very little in the way of cost containment in the bill.

Now, we do hear a lot of talk and there is a lot of rhetoric on the issue of preventive care. Preventive care, preventive medicine, you bet, I'm for that. The cost savings from preventive care, though, are much less certain and the timeline to achieving those cost savings is also uncertain. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office in its report to our committee in July delineated the very low rate of return on those savings and the fact that it might be years before those cost containments were achieved. That doesn't mean that it's not worthwhile, it doesn't mean that it's not worth doing, but to go to the American people with the statement that we're going to do all of these things and we're going to be able to pay for all this additional care by not cutting anyone's services, but because we're going to do things better, faster, cheaper, smarter just, in fact, does not square with the facts and the American people have seen through that.

Now, many of the studies have shown that in fact in the early years, by increasing the preventive regimen, the cost may in fact increase. And you would expect this to be the case because there is going to be more spent on the infrastructure necessary, more spent on the clinics, the exam rooms, professional personnel, nurse practitioners, paramedics, the physician extenders that are going to be necessary to see the increased numbers of patients who will be coming through those clinics as we increase the throughput through those clinics. So it is going to cost more money up front. I think there is broad recognition of that.

Now, we did hear some concern about the Medicare part D program. I would just simply remind people that Medicare part D, when it was passed in this House of Representatives back in 2003, Medicare part D was a prevention-based strategy. It only made sense, if you were going to cover the doctor's expense, if you were going to cover the hospitalization as was covered under Medicare's part A and B at the time and you did not allow for the coverage of a prescription drug benefit, that it was going to be much harder to deliver on the promise of preventative care without the medicines available to prevent the illnesses that you wish to prevent. It seemed relatively simple and straightforward in 2003, it seems relatively simple and straightforward now.

I think this Congress, I think the people who have written this bill would have done well to look at some of the things from the Medicare part D program that actually have worked very well. And true enough, there were some problems with Medicare part D as it was passed. There were some problems with implementation, I don't think

anyone would deny that. But the fact of the matter is that under the Medicare part D program, remember, there was no mandate. There was never a mandate that said a senior had to take a certain type of prescription drug coverage. Different levels of coverage were available to every senior. Every senior was encouraged to have some type of credible coverage for prescription drugs. There was a cut-off date beyond which there would be an increased cost for buying into the insurance program if someone did not enroll during the open enrollment period, but it did not come to us under the mantle of a mandate.

There was no requirement that every senior buy coverage. There was simply the recommendation that every senior have credible coverage under the plan. In fact, there were some benefits for people if they went ahead and established that credible coverage by a certain cut-off date. And what that meant was that the companies that were involved in providing the coverage then were competitive on the basis of trying to create programs that people actually wanted rather than saying we know you've got to buy this, so we're just going to put one or two programs out there and you can pick or choose from one or two and take it or leave it. Dr. McClellan, Mark McClellan, who at the time was head of Medicare and Medicaid Services, said there were going to be six protected classes of drugs within the program. Within each of those six classes there have to be at least two different choices. And with those relatively simple parameters, the companies were allowed to go out and construct programs and go out there and compete in the marketplace.

Now, we were told early on when we talked about this type of change in the Medicare part D program that in fact you will never get companies showing up to provide these products; you would have to mandate something, otherwise people just simply won't have any program at all from which to choose. But Dr. McClellan stuck to plan, and as a consequence, in some States we have well over 40 different plans that were there making available different types of Medicare part D coverage. In fact, we were criticized a year into the plan that there were too many choices, people couldn't possibly decide what to buy because there was too much choice out there. Well, in fact, it was a good problem to have. And as a consequence, now we have the Medicare part D program where the coverage rate is in excess of 90 percent, the satisfaction rate is in excessive 90 percent.

And it rivals any insurance program with a mandatory or coverage mandate, whether it be an individual or employer mandate. By creating the type of program that people actually want, that is actually useful, that actually matters to them in their lives, we have been able to provide more coverage to more people at lower costs

than anyone thought possible back in 2003 when the legislation was passed.

Now, we heard very many compelling anecdotes in the past 45 minutes about people with difficult problems in tough medical situations. And no one would argue that those are not compelling stories. I would just remind people that are studying this issue that the bill that we had before us that came out of the three committees, the bill that will likely come to the floor sometime this month, while it does provide for a public option and it does provide for a public option for coverage, those methods of coverage do not become generally available to the general population until 2013, 3 years after the enactment of the bill. So those are not going to be immediate benefits that are going to be accessible by any of the tough situations that you've heard described here in the last hour. In fact, those programs are going to lag significantly behind the start-up time of that bill.

Well, what can we expect in January when the bill starts if the bill is passed and signed as is planned? What can we count on in January? Well, you can count on the taxes occurring. Those certainly will. The taxes will begin January 1 of 2010. An 8 percent payroll tax on small business in this country. An 8 percent payroll tax may will be the largest single employment tax that has ever been passed in this country.

This may be the largest single job-killing event to occur in this young century. This is something that we need to be very, very careful about as we go about enacting this legislation because we are in the midst of a recession. We are hopeful that the recession is ending, but one of the difficult things about ending a recession, as we found in my early years here in 2003 and 2004, that as a recession ends, job growth does not necessarily follow immediately. What is the major engine of job growth in this country? Well, it's small business. So if we don't do anything to encourage small business and in fact we go so far as to hurt small business, it will be very, very difficult to grow those jobs that are actually going to be what ultimately lifts us out of this recession.

None of us likes to look forward to a jobless recovery, and yet that seems to be what's in the cards for us right now. This is a very serious situation and something to which this Congress should best place some heed because the absence of job growth in this economy will lead to that double dip or W-shaped recession that many economists talk about.

I did have several meetings with small business owners in my district. I conducted forums with small business owners just to hear their concerns about what Congress was doing. And yes, we heard some on the energy bill that was passed earlier this year and how that would be a job killing piece of legislation, but a lot of concern over what is happening in health care. And even more to the point, there is so

much uncertainty out there in the country right now. No one knows what we're going to do, Madam Speaker. Are we going to pass this bill? Are we going to put an 8 percent payroll tax on top of the taxes that small businesses already pay?

□ 2330

Many employers with whom I spoke told me, Yeah, the recession may be ending. We see some signs. Things seem to be easing up a little bit.

Well, are you going to expand your business? Are you going to be adding jobs? Are you going to be bringing back some of those jobs that you outsourced or laid off?

Well, I'm not so sure about that because the environment out there is kind of unsettled right now. We don't know what you're going to do with this health care bill. We don't know what you're going to do with that energy bill. As a consequence, we're going to put our expansion plans on hold for right now.

I heard this over and over and over again.

Now, to be sure, every business that I talked to was, perhaps, talking about adding one or two or three jobs, and they put those plans on hold, but when small businesses across the country are putting on hold plans of adding one, two or three jobs, spread over the entire country and over the entire economy, that's a significant number of jobs that are right now being held in limbo because, again, employers are not certain about what Congress is going to do next.

Well, I think one of the things that came through loud and clear for me in listening to my constituents during the month of August was that Congress fundamentally lacks the trust of the American people to do something this large, and it is very, very difficult to do this in a top-down centralized fashion. We really do need to recruit, to encourage and to educate the American people as to what we are trying to do and as to where the value for them is in it on what we are trying to do rather than to just simply superimpose this large government program on the American people.

You've heard it over and over again: Have you read the bill? Who can read the bill? It's too big. It's too complex. No one can understand it.

This is a valid complaint, and it's reflective of the fact that this legislation is large, that it is sweeping and that people do not trust the Congress to make those kinds of changes on a portion of their lives that is that important to them. People do not trust the Congress to be able to do the right thing.

We've heard over and over again from our constituents: Hey, if this is not even good enough for Members of Congress, why should we sign up for it? Why should we accept what you won't even take yourselves?

Now, to be sure, during the debates in the committees, there were a number

of amendments that were offered. Some suggested that whatever the public option is and whatever it turns out to be should be the type of insurance that Members of Congress and that members of the administration and their staffs are required to take. That is, if it is good enough for the American people, it ought to be good enough for the governing class as well. I don't disagree with that. That amendment was knocked out on a technicality in our committee, and we never had the chance to vote for it. That ruling was appealed, and the appeal of the motion of the Chair was upheld on a party-line vote. So, essentially, every Democrat said, Hey, we don't want this coverage for ourselves. Every Republican said that we should at least have the debate, that we should at least hear the amendment and that we should hear from both sides on this issue, but we weren't allowed to do it. It was shut down in committee on a party-line vote.

I had an amendment that would have made Medicaid available to every Member of Congress. Congress could be a mandatory population under Medicaid, so every Member of Congress would be covered under the Medicaid system, and every Member of Congress would then understand what it is like to try to find a physician—doctor—for themselves or for a family member in the Medicaid system. It can be very difficult to do that. Why is that? Because reimbursement rates under Medicaid are so low that members of the medical profession simply cannot afford to take large numbers of Medicaid patients into their practices for fear that they won't be able to cover their overhead and for fear that they will not be able to keep their practices open.

Again, on a technicality, this was prevented from a vote, and it just underscores the hubris of the United States Congress when it will consider doing things to the American people, those things it would never consider doing to Members of Congress. People see that and they resent that. They can feel that it is not right that a Member of Congress would vote on a type of bill that would require Americans to take a certain type of insurance when that Member of Congress would have no intention of taking that insurance himself.

We heard it in some of the townhalls that were conducted by the White House: Is this insurance something that will be good enough for members in the White House and for members of their staffs?

No, not necessarily. We want something good for members of the White House.

It is exactly that type of hubris that has gotten people so upset. We could deal with that. We could deal with that by requiring that any public option or that even Medicaid is something that is not just made available but required of Members of Congress, but we won't

have that discussion. We won't have that debate. It somehow seems to be demeaning or beneath us to have that debate, but certainly that's a problem we could fix and that we could fix pronto.

There was nothing in this bill that dealt with liability reform. As a physician, I will tell you that that is one of the single largest issues that faces physicians in this country. It is the constant threat of medical litigation, the expense of medical liability insurance and the cost of defensive medicine that drives the cost of the practice of medicine literally through the roof.

A study back in 1996 by Dr. McClellan from Stanford University at that time estimated a cost of nearly \$30 billion for two diagnoses in the Medicare system because of defensive medicine. Well, that was in dollars of 12 or 13 years ago. Imagine what those dollars have grown to today in our current liability climate.

This is something that the American people understand needs to be fixed, and they simply do not understand why Congress will not at least consider entertaining the debate. What they see is that this is something that is being blocked by special interests and that this is something that is being blocked by a certain lobbyist group that is being prevented from even being discussed in a congressional committee. The American people look at that and say, Well, that's not right. We cannot possibly believe anything else that's in that bill, because we don't trust you to have a rational discussion about this.

I dare say, if liability reform and fairness in the physician compensation system had been on the table at the very beginning, you might well have had some Republicans on board for this bill right from the start.

What I do know is that you never tried. Never did any of the committee chairmen, Madam Speaker, and never did the President or the White House seriously try to achieve any type of bipartisan balance in this bill. It simply was of no interest to them because—and I'll go back to my early remarks about the arithmetic in the House—they can lose 40 votes in the House and still pass a bill. They have 60 votes in the Senate. They can cut off debate at any time and pass a bill and send it down to the White House and get it signed into law.

We heard over and over again in our townhalls this summer about the problems with preexisting conditions and about the problems with insurance rescission. We're talking about insurance reform. That is something that we could accomplish. Yes, there are some thorny issues to be addressed, but it's certainly no more difficult than anything else we've taken on. We could have solved that problem. We could have debated that problem. We could have voted on that problem before we went home for the August recess, and we could have shown the American people that, in fact, we were serious

about taking care of a very serious problem that affects 8 to 10 million people in this country, a problem that prevents them from getting the health care coverage they would like to have.

Yes, there are going to be some difficult arguments to have over rating bans. Yes, there are going to be some difficult arguments as to whether or not there is a premium cap or whether or not there is a premium to be paid for someone's not having had insurance before someone got a tough diagnosis. We can have those arguments. There perhaps could be new moneys made available in State and Federal subsidies for people who can't afford the cost of a State high-risk pool. Nevertheless, we could have those debates. We could have those arguments. We could look at those figures and decide what a correct number would be. Again, that is something that is easily within our level of achievement, and this House could have done it before we went home for August, but for some reason, we chose not to.

On the issue of portability, we could have dealt with that before we went home for the August recess. One of the biggest problems that people are having right now is job loss because of the recession. Yes, if someone loses his job and he has employer-sponsored insurance, it becomes tough to continue that insurance. Under COBRA, employer-sponsored insurance has to be offered for the next 18 months, but it's extremely expensive. For someone who has just lost his job, to be able to cover his portion and the employer's portion and an administrative fee becomes terribly difficult, but we could have dealt with that. The fact of the matter is we chose not to. We chose to go home for the August recess with our work being undone, and the American people saw right through that. That's why they were so frustrated with us in the month of August.

Now, we heard on one of the Sunday shows this weekend that the President's main adviser said, In some States, why, there is no competition. There's only one insurer.

Well, how do you deal with that if there is only one insurer in some States? Do you really make the situation measurably better by adding a second insurer? Well, maybe. If it's a government-run program, then maybe that's a good thing. Maybe it's a bad thing. Maybe you run out the one insurer who was there already, and you're back to one insurer which is now the public option. There are 1,300 different insurance companies out there. If we would simply relax some of the restrictions against selling across State lines, we could open those markets up, not to one other insurer, not to ten other insurers, but to hundreds of other insurers.

□ 2340

That's real competition in the marketplace. The same type of competition you see today for car insurance

and for life insurance and with the power of the Internet, those costs have come down significantly for those two products. We could have achieved the same type of success in the health insurance market if we were just clever enough to have the discussion and begin to negotiate how we would go about putting the protections in place so that people weren't taken advantage of in that situation, and that's well within our power to do that, Madam Speaker.

I again come back to the concept that Members of Congress were not willing to take the very insurance that they were requiring the American people to take. When you talk about hubris, that's one of the things I heard over and over again. The bill is too big; nobody knows what's in it. You haven't even read the darn thing and why won't; if it's so darn good, why won't a Member of Congress sign up for it?

We heard those same comments over and over and over again. And what did they tell us? It's a big bill. People are frightened of Congress' ability to actually deliver on a bill like this or ability to deliver on a promise like this. And if it is so darn good, then why aren't you willing to step up and take it yourself?

And that really distills the arguments that we heard during the month of August. Now, unfortunately, coupled with all of this—and we heard some of the comments in the last hour when the Democrats had the floor—you heard the comment made, Madam Speaker, that it's the right-wing talk radio crowd that's causing the objections to this health care bill, otherwise it would be done.

I submit to you the right-wing talk radio crowd is my crowd. They talk to Republicans. But it's only 177 Republicans in the House of Representatives. You have got 258 Democrats. The right-wing talk radio crowd doesn't talk to the 258 Democrats, and you can still lose 39 Democrats and pass almost any bill that you want out of the House.

So, please, it is not a Republican that is preventing you from doing this. Recognize what's happening here. It is the fact that you have not sold this bill to the American people. That's what's preventing this from being done.

Now, the other unfortunate thing this summer was the Speaker of the House took it upon herself and the majority leader took it upon himself to write a joint op-ed piece for USA Today where they vilified the American people. Well, you know, if you are trying to build a grass-roots consensus for what you are trying to do, for something as big as transforming the delivery of health care in this country, is it really a smart idea to vilify the very people whom you are trying to recruit to help you to do this project? I don't think so.

I mean, that's Politics 101. That's one of the first tenets. You don't, you don't, you don't irritate the very people that you are going to be asking to help you pass a bill of this magnitude.

I do believe it is possible, that it is reasonable for us to get down and work on some of these things that I have outlined tonight. I suspect there are others out there that people on both sides of the aisle might like to see. These are just mine that came up during my town halls.

I would like to see us have some serious discussions on this. I think the American people really do want to see this done in a bipartisan fashion.

Now, tomorrow night we are going to have a big speech here in the House. The President will come down; all of our friends from the Senate will be here. We may well have members of the Cabinet here as well to hear what the President is going to say.

Will there be something new brought up tomorrow night? I don't know. Will we simply see, hear a rehash of the same things? Will we hear criticisms of Republicans for not working with Democrats on this issue? We might.

I would just simply again offer that we don't have the numbers to stop anything; and when I made overtures to the other side early this year, in fact, even during the transition period before the President was sworn in on inauguration day, completely rebuffed by the chairman of my committee, by the President's transition team. No one seemed interested in any Republican input at that point.

We have got the votes, we won the election, we can do it all and so we shall.

Well, it's August. It was a hot month; things got a little heated at home. And now that we are back here in the fall working on this, perhaps it is time to rethink this.

I saw it on one of the Web sites the other day: maybe it's time for the President to hit the reset button. Maybe that's not a bad idea. This is a big, big change in the way things are being handled in America in regards to health care.

The benefits in this bill don't go into effect for 3 years' time. There is no rush to do this thing this month. There is time for us to get this right.

And, you know, like the old saying goes, if you don't have time to do it right when are you going to find time to do it over? Or as one of my surgery professors used to tell me years ago, this is so important, let's go slowly. We don't have time to be in a hurry.

Well, I think those are words that might serve us well as we continue to work on this legislation.

We are going to hear from the President tomorrow night. I, for one, am looking forward to what he is going to say. I would welcome the fact that perhaps we can all get back together and work on some of these things. My concept would be on let's keep it a little bit simpler so that we do build some trust back with the American people.

Certainly the President enjoys a much higher popularity figure, much higher poll numbers than any of us in the United States House of Representa-

tives have. But, on the other hand, that popularity is waning as well.

I think it's important that the American people see that we can work together on this, that we can produce deliverables for the country. And I, for one, would be happy to get on with that work.

With that, Madam Speaker, I am going to yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of recovering from back surgery.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel issues.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and September 9 on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. DREIER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of events in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, September 9, 10, 14 and 15.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, September 9 and 10.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, September 9, 10, 14 and 15.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and September 14.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for 5 minutes, today and September 10.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, September 10, 14 and 15.

Mr. BARTLETT, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 713. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to quickly and fairly address the abundance of surplus manufactured housing units stored by the Federal Government around the country at taxpayer expense, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 748. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2777 Logan Avenue in San Diego, California, as the "Cesar E. Chavez Post Office"; the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1211. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 School Street, Orchard Park, New York, as the "Jack F. Kemp Post Office Building"; the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HOYER, on Thursday, August 6, 2009:

H.R. 774. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, as the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building".

H.R. 987. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 8th Street in Freedom, Pennsylvania, as the "John Scott Challis, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 1271. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 1275. An act to direct the exchange of certain land in Grand, San Juan, and Uintah Counties, Utah, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1397. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building".

H.R. 2090. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 431 State Street in Ogdensburg, New York, as the "Frederic Remington Post Office Building".

H.R. 2162. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 11th Avenue South in Nampa, Idaho, as the "Herbert A. Littleton Postal Station".

H.R. 2325. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Matamoros Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "Laredo Veterans Post Office".

H.R. 2422. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2300 Scenic Drive in Georgetown, Texas, as the "Kile G. West Post Office Building".

H.R. 2470. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 19190 Cochran Boulevard FRNT in Port Charlotte, Florida, as the "Lieutenant Commander Roy H. Boehm Post Office Building".

H.R. 2938. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 3435. An act making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program.

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution recognizing the service, sacrifice, honor, and professionalism of the Noncommissioned Officers of the United States Army.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HOYER, announced his signature on Thursday, August 6, 2009 to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to amendments made by the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on August 4, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3357. To restore sums to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House also reports that on August 6, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3435. Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Program.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House also reports that on August 11, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 2938. To extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project.

H.R. 1275. To direct the exchange of certain land in Grand, San Juan, and Uintah Counties, Utah, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 44. Recognizing the service, sacrifice, honor, and professionalism of the Noncommissioned Officers of the United States Army.

H.R. 2470. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 19190 Cochran Boulevard FRNT in Port Charlotte, Florida, as the "Lieutenant Commander Roy H. Boehm Post Office Building."

H.R. 2325. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Matamoros Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "Laredo Veterans Post Office."

H.R. 2422. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2300 Scenic Drive in Georgetown, Texas, as the "Kile G. West Post Office Building."

H.R. 2090. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 431 State Street in Ogdensburg, New York, as the "Frederic Remington Post Office Building."

H.R. 2162. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 11th Avenue South in Nampa, Idaho, as the "Herbert A. Littleton Postal Station."

H.R. 1397. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 41 Purdy Avenue in Rye, New York, as the "Caroline O'Day Post Office Building."

H.R. 1271. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building."

H.R. 987. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 8th Street in Freedom, Pennsylvania, as the "John Scott Challis, Jr. Post Office."

H.R. 774. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46-02 21st Street in Long Island City, New York, as the "Geraldine Ferraro Post Office Building."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 9, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the second quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, KAY A. KING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 14 AND APR. 20, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kay A. King	4/14	4/15	Cyprus		424.85		(³)				424.85
	4/15	4/19	India		1,392.74		(³)				1,392.74
	4/19	4/20	Italy		331.76		(³)				331.76
Committee totals											2,149.35

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., Chairman, July 13, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, Chairwoman, July 16, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ZOE LOFGREN, Chairwoman, July 17, 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman, July 27, 2009.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3012. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pasteuria usage; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0881; FRL-8429-1] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3013. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alkyl Alcohol Alkoxylate Phosphate and Sulfate Derivatives; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0131; FRL-8424-6] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3014. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methl Poly(Oxyethylene)C8-C18 Alkylammonium Chlorides; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0042; FRL-8424-4] received July

29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3015. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — N-alkyl (C8-C18) Primary Amines and Acetate Salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0046; FRL-8428-9] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3016. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium salts of N-alkyl (C8-C18)-beta-iminodipropionic acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0098; FRL-8425-5] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3017. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter providing "the waiver, the determination, and the reasons for the determination", in reference to the Department's June 11, 2009 letter required by Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02, and in accordance with title 10 U.S.C. section 2366b(a)(1)(B) and (D); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3018. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Co-

operation Account", for the period ending June 30, 2009, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3019. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of an officer to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of rear admiral, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3020. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report on the Acquisition Challenge Program for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2359 (B) (J); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3021. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's legal opinion on whether the Department of Defense violated appropriations prohibitions on publicity or propaganda activities by offering special access to prominent persons in the private sector who serve as media analysts, pursuant to Public Law 110-417, section 1056(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3022. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification that it is estimated that the limitation on the Government National Mortgage Association's (Ginnie Mae's) authority to make commitments for a fiscal year will be reached before the end of that fiscal year, pursuant to 12

U.S.C. 1721 nt.; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3023. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's report covering the activities of the Office of Financial Stability and the TARP during the period of June 1, 2009 to June 30, 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3024. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Stability, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's summary of response to the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program's (SIGTARP) April 21, 2009 recommendations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3025. A letter from the Office of the Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting the Office's quarterly report to Congress of the Office of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program SIGTARP, for the period ending June 30, 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3026. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Regulation SHO [Release No. 34-60388; File No. S7-19-07] (RIN: 3235-AK22) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3027. A letter from the Special Inspector General For The Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting the Office's quarterly report on the actions undertaken by the Department of the Treasury under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the activities of SIGTARP, and SIGTARP'S recommendations with respect to operations of TARP, for the period ending June 30, 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3028. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Enhancing the Health and Wellness of Individuals With Neuromuscular Diseases and Enhancing the Health and Wellness of Individuals with Arthritis — received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3029. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting renewal of the April 26, 2009 determination of a public health emergency existing nationwide involving Swine Influenza A (now called 2009 — H1N1 flu), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a) Public Law 107-188, section 144(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3030. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting draft legislation to implement several proposals included in the President's Fiscal Year 2010 Budget that will improve management of the radio spectrum and represent sound economic policy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3031. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) [EPA-R06-OAR-2009-0214; FRL-8939-4] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3032. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Clean Air Interstate Rule [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0033; FRL-8939-7] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3033. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerator Units, Plan Revision [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0482; FRL-8938-6] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3034. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units, Plan revision [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0463; FRL-8938-8] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3035. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR): Reconsideration of Inclusion of Fugitive Emissions [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0014; FRL-8937-8] received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3036. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 06-09 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3037. A letter from the Special Inspector General, Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the July 2009 Quarterly Report on reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan, pursuant to Public Law 110-181; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3038. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-09, the Department's intent to sign Memorandum of Understanding with Canada Concerning Special Forces Equipment Capability, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3039. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's intent to sign Amendment Number 9 to the Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Cooperative Framework for System Development and Demonstration of the Joint Strike Fighter, Transmittal No. 05-09, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3040. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 08-09 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with Canada and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3041. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-42, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3042. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal

No. 09-20, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as Amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3043. A letter from the Vice Admiral, USN, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-33, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3044. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles (Transmittal No. DDTC 047-09); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3045. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning an amendment to Section 123.17(f) of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), promulgated pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, 22 U.S.C. Section 2778, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles and defense services, (Transmittal No. DDTC 060-09); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3047. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting correspondence from Speaker Luka Bebic of the Croatian Parliament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services, Transmittal No. DDTC 049-09; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3049. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, Transmittal No. DDTC 048-09; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3050. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d)(3) of the Arms Control Act, certification of a proposed transfer of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, Transmittal No. DDTC 034-09; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3051. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's 2009 Report on Achieving Maximum Compatibility among Foreign Service Agencies (pursuant to Section 601(c)(4) of the Foreign Service Agencies) and the Five-Year Workforce Plan for Fiscal Years 2008 through 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3052. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Advancing Freedom and Democracy", pursuant to Public Law 110-53, section 2121; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3053. A letter from the Maj. Gen. USMC (ret.), Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the

fourth quarterly report on the Afghanistan reconstruction, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, section 1229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3054. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3055. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2008 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3056. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3057. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3058. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3059. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3060. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3061. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3062. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3063. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3064. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3065. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3066. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3067. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3068. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3069. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3070. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3071. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3072. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3073. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3074. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3075. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3076. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3077. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3078. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3079. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2008, in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M-09-04; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3080. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3081. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report to Congress on a gift of Land in Socorro County, New Mexico, from the Friends of Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, pursuant to Public Law 93-632; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3082. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Port of Anchorage Marine Terminal Redevelopment Project, Anchorage, Alaska [Docket No.: 090206146-91055-02] (RIN: 0648-AX32) received June 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3083. A letter from the Acting Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's FY 2008 Report to Congress U.S. Government Receivables and Debt Collection Activities of Federal Agencies, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3716(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3084. A letter from the transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Missouri River, Mile 028.2 to 028.8 [COTP Upper Mississippi River-08-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3085. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Security Zones, Sabine Bank Channel and Sabine Pass Channel, Sabine, TX [COTP Port Arthur 08-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3086. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-07-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3087. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-07-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3088. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2009 Rates for Pilotage on the Great Lakes [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1126] (RIN: 1625-AB29) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3089. A letter from the Attorney—Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Friends of Fireworks Celebration, Lake Huron, St. Ignace, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0649] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3090. A letter from the Attorney—Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Kinnickinnic River Sediment Removal Project, Milwaukee, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0399-] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3091. A letter from the Attorney—Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Oak Island, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0565] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3092. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Ernest Lyons (SR A1A), Stuart FL, and Memorial Clearwater Causeway (SR 60), Clearwater, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2007-0129] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3093. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting Safety Zone; James River, Navy Live Fire and Explosive Training [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0568] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3094. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display at the Craneway Building, Richmond, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0521] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3095. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks displays within the Captain of the Port Pudget Sound Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0532] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3096. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Norfolk Tides Post-Game Fireworks Displays, Elizabeth River, Norfolk, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0274] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3097. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Manasquan River, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0233] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received July 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3098. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Intercoastal Waterway, Mile 418 Sargent, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-07-0028] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3099. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Coast Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3100. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3101. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3102. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3103. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3104. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone, Northeast Cape Fear River and Holly Shelter Creek, Pender County, North Carolina [CGD05-09-114] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3105. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3106. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3107. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile Marker 598.0 to Mile Marker 605.0, Louisville, KY [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley 08-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3108. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Houston Ship Channel, Houston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3109. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile Markers 602.5 to 603.5, Louisville, KY [COTP Ohio Valley-08-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3110. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-06-0010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3111. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River Mile Marker 602.3 to 603, Lenoir City, TN [Docket No.: COTP Ohio Valley-08-009] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3112. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-06-0032] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3113. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX [COTP Port Arthur-07-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3114. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-06-0033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3115. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX [COTP Port Arthur-07-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3116. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-06-0034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3117. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-06-0035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3118. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3119. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-07-0002] received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3120. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 845.5 to 846.5, J. T. Myers Lock and Dam, IN [COTP Ohio Valley-08-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3121. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-07-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3122. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

3152. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009.

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3153. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Freeport Entrance Channel, Between Green Buoy #3 and Red Buoy #4, Freeport, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3154. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3155. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3156. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3157. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, mile marker 328 to 330 [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3158. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3159. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 357.3 Galveston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-08-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3160. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, MM 653 to 650, Westover Landing [COTP Lower Mississippi River-08-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3161. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River (LMR), Mile Marker 433.0 to 439.0 [COTP Lower Mississippi River-08-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3162. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Minneapolis, MN [Docket

No.: FAA-2009-0062; Airspace Docket No. 09-AGL-2] received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3163. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Sioux City, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1104; Airspace Docket No. 08-ACE-2] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3164. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Columbus, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1185; Airspace Docket No. 08-AGL-11] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3165. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Milwaukee, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1291; Airspace Docket No. 08-AGL-20] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3166. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's fifth report on the breakdown of the disability-related complaints that U.S. and foreign passenger air carriers operating to and from the U.S. received during 2008, pursuant to Section 707 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3167. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ankeny, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0187; Airspace Docket No. 09-ACE-3] received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3168. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0735; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-15803; AD 2009-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3169. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Umat, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0455; Airspace Docket No. 08-AAL-14] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3170. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gippsland Aeronautics Pty. Ltd. Model GA8 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0155; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-15825; AD 2009-05-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3171. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tower, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1186; Airspace Docket No. 08-AGL-12] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3172. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Medford, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1211; Airspace Docket No. 08-AGL-13] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3173. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30647, Amdt. No. 3304] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3174. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30648, Amdt. 3305] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3175. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG, BR700-715A1-30, BR700-715B1-30, and BR700-715C1-30 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0169; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-45-AD; Amendment 39-15819; AD 2009-04-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3176. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Model DHC-6-1, DHC-6-100, DHC-6-200, and DHC-6-300 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1267; Directorate Identifier 2008-CD-069-AD; Amendment 39-15815; AD 2009-04-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3177. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS AIRCRAFT LTD. Model PC-12/47E Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0146; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-15820; AD 2009-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3178. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0613; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-15794; AD 2009-02-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3179. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30650, Amdt. 3307] received June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3180. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30649, Amdt. No. 3306] received

June 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3181. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30676; Amdt. No. 3330] received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3182. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-102, DHC-8-103, DHC-8-106, DHC-8-201, DHC-8-202, DHC-8-301, DHC-8-311, and DHC-8-315 Airplanes Equipped with a Cockpit Door Electronic Strike System Installed in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) ST02014NY [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0313; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-15769; AD 2008-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3183. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1201; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-15922; AD 2009-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3184. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30677; Amdt. No. 3331] received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3185. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc., T5313 and T5317 Series Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1311; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-48-AD; Amendment 39-15976; AD 2009-15-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3186. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and -400D Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-28988; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-047-AD; Amendment 39-15975; AD 2009-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3187. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1365; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-15970; AD 2009-15-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3188. A letter from the Dir, Regulation Policy & Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Elimination of Requirement for Prior Signature Consent and Pre- and Post-Test Counseling for HIV Testing (RIN: 2900-AN20) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3189. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cargo Container and Road Vehicle Certification Pursuant to International Conventions: Designated Certifying Authorities (RIN: 1651-AA78) received July 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3190. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Liquor Dealer Recordkeeping and Registration, and Repeal of Certain Special (Occupational) Taxes [Docket No.: TTB-2009-0003; T.D. TTB-79; Re: Notice No. 96] (RIN: 1513-AB63) received July 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3191. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 126-Certain Cost-Sharing Payments Forest Health Protection Program (Rev. Rul. 2009-03) received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3192. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treatment of Fails Charges for purposes of sections 871, 881, 1441 and 1442 [Notice 2009-61] received July 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3193. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled, "The Year in Trade 2008", pursuant to Section 163(c) of the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3194. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to collect certain fees under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as indicated in the President's Fiscal Year 2010 Budget; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Agriculture.

3195. A letter from the Inspector General, Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) July 2009 Quarterly Report and Semiannual Report, pursuant to Public Law 108-106, section 3001; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

3196. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the Economic Development Administration for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3217; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce.

3197. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting Proposal to improve the way the Nation raises the revenues need to cover the non-Federal share of capital costs of inland and intracoastal waterways projects; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

3198. A letter from the Regulation Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Hospice Wage Index for Fiscal Year 2010 [CMS-1420-F] (RIN: 0938-AP45) received July 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3199. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Of-

fice of the President, transmitting the Office's 2009 Report on the Technology Transfer Program (TTP) for the Previous Year, pursuant to ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

3200. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1842-DR for the state of Alabama, pursuant to Public Law 110-329, section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

3201. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1841-DR for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, pursuant to Public Law 110-329 section 539; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

3202. A letter from the Acting Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual reports that appear on page 119-144 of the March 2009 "Treasury Bulletin", pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, and Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3193. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 101 South United States Route 1 in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the "Alto Lee Adams, Sr., United States Courthouse" (Rept. 111-245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2121. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain Federal property to the Galveston Historical Foundation; with amendments (Rept. 111-246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 136. A resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a celebration of Citizenship Day (Rept. 111-247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 3165. A bill to provide for a program of wind energy research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 3533. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to clarify and ensure the effective implementation of certain children's product safety provisions added by the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3534. A bill to provide greater efficiencies, transparency, returns, and accountability in the administration of Federal mineral and energy resources by consolidating administration of various Federal energy minerals management and leasing programs into one entity to be known as the Office of Federal Energy and Minerals Leasing of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 3535. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reduce the amount of Federal highway funding available to States that do not enact a law prohibiting an individual from sending or receiving text messages while operating a motor vehicle; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HARE, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 3536. A bill to provide for an increase of \$150 in social security benefits for one month in 2010 to compensate for the lack of a cost-of-living adjustment for that year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend and reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. MINNICK):

H.R. 3538. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIRE (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 3539. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the "Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 3540. A bill to modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WU, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the period beginning on September 21, 2009, and ending on September 25, 2009, as "National Health Information Technology Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H. Res. 721. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any major health care reform bill considered on the floor of the House should be available for viewing for 30 calendar days; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself and Mr. BOEHNER):

H. Res. 722. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the terrorist attacks launched against the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

161. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 114 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to maintain the private, dual charter banking system as well as to preserve the thrift charter and mutuality; to the Committee on Financial Services.

162. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 102 memorializing the United States Congress to enact H.R. 521, the Stillbirth Awareness and Research Act of 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

163. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 339 memorializing that the President of the United States and the Congress to work together with the State of Illinois to ensure the viability of the Chrysler plant in Belvidere; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

164. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1004 memorializing the United States Congress to pass the American Sovereignty Restoration Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

165. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2006 memorializing the United States Congress to refrain from enacting any legislation affecting Arizona's Public Lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

166. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 208 memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to oppose changes in the federal tax policy and to reject these changes in the President's Budget in order to avoid catastrophic damage to Louisiana's oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

167. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4022 memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President to enact federal legislation to repeal perverse federal tax subsidies to United States companies that move manufacturing operations and American jobs offshore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

168. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 36 memorializing the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States to provide additional aid to the State of Hawai'i for state services to migrants from the Compact of Free Association Na-

tions; to the Committee on Select Comm Narcotics Abuse & Control.

169. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 62 memorializing the Department of the Interior and the United States Congress to provide additional federal aid to the State of Hawai'i for the provision of various state services to migrants from the Compact of Free Association Nations; to the Committee on Select Comm Narcotics Abuse & Control.

170. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 67 memorializing the United States Congress to oppose specified proposed rule amendments for the Developmental Disabilities Programs that implement the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights and to support new sections in the upcoming reauthorization; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

171. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 90 memorializing the United States Congress to oppose specified proposed rule amendments for the Developmental Disabilities program and to support new sections in the upcoming reauthorization; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

172. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 215 memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to promptly consider and pass the New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions Act of 2009 (H.R. 1835) and to urge each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation to express their support for the Act by becoming a cosponsor; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and Science and Technology.

173. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 158 memorializing the Congress of the United States to support the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Science and Technology, Education and Labor, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. WATERS introduced a bill (H.R. 3541) for the relief of Rafael Camacho, Rosa B. Camacho, and Rosa Camacho; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 55: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 163: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 235: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 303: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 330: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 370: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 426: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 537: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 571: Mr. BONNER, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CAO, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. COBLE.

- H.R. 614: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 615: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 618: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. KIL-DEE.
H.R. 621: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. BEAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. Harper, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 622: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 690: Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 716: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 881: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 916: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 930: Mr. SHULER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 932: Mr. TURNER, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 953: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 965: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 997: Mr. BONNER, Mr. MICA, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1086: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1101: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1135: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1173: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1182: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 1189: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1193: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1203: Mr. SHULER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MINNICK, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1207: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H.R. 1215: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1230: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1254: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1327: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHULER, Ms. KILROY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 1392: Mr. MASSA, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1409: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1410: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1441: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1443: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1458: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1499: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1505: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1507: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1521: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1523: Mr. OLVER and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1526: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1544: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1547: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1549: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1558: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1587: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1588: Mr. BONNER and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1597: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1608: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Ms. TSON-GAS.
H.R. 1614: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1670: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1685: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1700: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1707: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1708: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 1710: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1719: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1744: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1751: Ms. CHU, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1815: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1816: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1835: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. JONES, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1844: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1866: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1887: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1894: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 1895: Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1927: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROSS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1993: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2017: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MICA, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 2055: Mr. FALOMAVEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2058: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2084: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2085: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2103: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2139: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2149: Mr. DENT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2214: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HODES, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2215: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 2239: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2243: Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2261: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2269: Mr. CLAY and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2276: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2329: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2332: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2358: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2387: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2404: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2408: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2414: Ms. CHU, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2478: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2480: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2492: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2499: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2523: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2547: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 2558: Mr. CAO.
H.R. 2560: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2563: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2567: Mr. PAUL, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2612: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2690: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2709: Mr. COHEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2721: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2724: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2737: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CAO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2756: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2766: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2802: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2819: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2840: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2842: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 2859: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2866: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2882: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2891: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2906: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2935: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3008: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3010: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3012: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 3017: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3040: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3042: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3044: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. McKEON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3046: Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 3127: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3140: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 3165: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3177: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3188: Ms. FALLIN.
H.R. 3191: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3225: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3226: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 3227: Mr. SESTAK and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 3242: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3246: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 3249: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3250: Ms. WATSON, Mr. MASSA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 3287: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3308: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3322: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 3339: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3348: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FALOMAVEGA, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 3400: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3401: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3407: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 3415: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 3416: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 3467: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3488: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.J. Res. 61: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. BEAN.
 H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. SESTAK and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H. Con. Res. 151: Mr. PITTS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H. Res. 90: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H. Res. 167: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. DICKS.
 H. Res. 236: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H. Res. 267: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. Res. 383: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H. Res. 447: Mr. DENT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP

of New York, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CAO, Mr. HILL, and Mr. COBLE.
 H. Res. 486: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. ROYCE.
 H. Res. 494: Mr. SESTAK.
 H. Res. 577: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Res. 581: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
 H. Res. 615: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. DENT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. SHADEGG.
 H. Res. 619: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H. Res. 641: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H. Res. 676: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. HOLDEN.
 H. Res. 679: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HODES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WU, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. EHLERS.
 H. Res. 686: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H. Res. 695: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. REYES.
 H. Res. 700: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H. Res. 701: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H. Res. 703: Mr. RUSH.
 H. Res. 707: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 718: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SIRE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPACE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

65. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Miami Commission, Florida, relative to City of Miami Legislation Resolution: R-09-0282 petitioning for the immediate enactment of the Administration's Health Care Reform Principles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.